

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526
2013-0710-M (1.01)
02/27/2020 KDE

SEGMENT I: EUROPE (6:30-7:30 P.M.)

EUROPEAN SECURITY/NATO ENLARGEMENT

- NATO enlargement top priority for second term -- key test of American leadership. Requires Senate ratification, House support because of new security commitments.
- European security vital U.S. interest; through NATO, NATO enlargement and NATO-Russia, have opportunity, for first time in history, to build secure, undivided, democratic Europe.
- NATO enlargement will project stability and security into all of Europe; will strengthen and safeguard region's democratic and free-market transformation.
- Prospect of NATO membership strengthening democratic forces in Eastern Europe, weakening nationalists, promoting resolution of regional disputes (e.g., Hungary-Romania).
- Won't let Russian pressure spook us. Had we taken initial Russian "no" in 1989, Germany would not be reunited today. Won't bring Russia in by keeping other democracies out.
- Helsinki put NATO-Russia on track without sacrificing enlargement, which is moving forward on schedule.
- NATO-Russia relationship -- via Charter, formal consultative mechanism -- can bring Russia into emerging security system.

Costs/Robust NATO Posture

- Current threat low. Defense of new members possible through reinforcement and modernization of new members' forces.
- Therefore, NATO concluded no need to permanently station substantial NATO combat forces; no intention or need to deploy nuclear forces on soil of new members.
- U.S. costs affordable: \$150-200M per year. Costs to new members also affordable -- as CEE governments already said.
- New NATO members will be valuable, committed members. IFOR -- where Poles, Czechs, others have combat troops; Hungary supplying bases -- shows CEE will make meaningful contribution.

Why not EU enlargement vice NATO? (if raised)

- EU, NATO enlargement part of same historic process. Both important, not mutually exclusive.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Reason: 1.5 (b) (d)

Declassify on: 04/11/07

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- EU not equipped to be lead organization for European security and integration, as Bosnia demonstrated. Key to long-term European stability is U.S. engagement and leadership, which comes only through NATO.

American people don't support (if raised)

- Americans not isolationist: Majority (62%) support NATO enlargement to Poland, Czech, Hungary; 68% would favor defending Poland with U.S. troops.

Why enlarge NATO absent a threat? (if raised)

- Need NATO enlargement for same reason we need NATO: America's core alliance in uncertain world. Cannot foresee all threats, but know preparedness deters them. Through enlargement can extend same stability to Central Europe that Western Europe enjoyed for 45 years.
- Failure to enlarge NATO would betray our traditions and America's role throughout 20th century. Must not exclude countries that have demonstrated commitment to defend our common values and to share in common burdens.

RUSSIA

- Supporting development of democracy and market economy in Russia profoundly in America's interest -- one of my highest foreign policy priorities.
- Have historic opportunity to convert adversarial relationship into partnership for 21st century.
- Yeltsin back in charge. New team has potential to take on economic problems that overshadow everything else in Russia.
- Yeltsin showed at Helsinki ready to tackle tough issues and make decisions. Summit reenergized U.S.-Russian relations.
 - Important progress on arms control: START, ABM/TMD.
 - Turned corner on NATO enlargement. Russia opposed, but ready to develop NATO-Russia relationship.
 - Defined path to stimulate trade and investment; will bolster reform in Russia and mean new jobs for Americans.
- Russian reform -- and bilateral relations - likely be bumpy road, but overall direction positive.
- Bipartisan support critical, especially for FY-98 Partnership for Freedom request. Funding for Russia, NIS will promote trade

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

and investment, lock in reforms, expand people-to-people contacts that will forge important ties with tomorrow's leaders.

BOSNIA

- Difficult challenge of building lasting peace in Bosnia continues. Must not forget enormous progress made.
- In summer of 1995, bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II raged. Few believed peace possible; many questioned NATO's role in post-Cold War era.
- Since then, U.S. leadership produced Dayton Accords, and revitalized NATO helped consolidate peace, providing environment for political reconciliation and economic reconstruction.
- Efforts in Bosnia have exceeded expectations:
 - Implemented military aspects of Dayton with no combat casualties; held national elections in September; created joint national institutions; returned more than 200,000 refugees.
 - U.S.-led, Train-and-Equip program building stable military balance and facilitating formation of joint defense structures.
 - Making progress on economic reconstruction, especially in Bosniak-Croat Federation. Today, Sarajevo bustles with reconstruction; hundreds of cafes, shops, banks and other commercial endeavors open.
- Still have long way to go: must do more to rebuild economy, create jobs, stimulate investment. Need greater cooperation from parties on freedom of movement and return of refugees.
- Bosnian people, with help of international NGOs, must assume responsibility for building own future.
- SFOR will provide stability and confidence for Bosnian people to continue toward these goals. Withdrawal of U.S. forces in mid-1998 should give sufficient time to ensure self-sustaining peace.
- Early, unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops would endanger progress made since Dayton. Could lead to resumption of war with resulting crisis in NATO; would erode U.S. credibility and leadership around world.
- Strongly urge your support for our efforts in Bosnia. Stability in Europe central to U.S. interests, as is preserving U.S.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

leadership of strong, effective NATO as it embarks on enlargement and new partnership with Russia.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

SEGMENT II: Dinner and Discussion (8:00 - 8:45 p.m.)

150 RESOURCES

- Foreign affairs programs small part of federal budget -- about 1% of spending. But that 1% is perhaps most important parts of budget.
- Helps us to avoid wars and save lives; stems inflow of illegal drugs; helps us in war on terrorism; promotes democracy and other American values; and stimulates American exports and jobs.
- International affairs spending has fallen by roughly 20%, in real terms, over past four years. Steep decline has diminished ability to influence events overseas, raised serious questions about our willingness to remain engaged in international arena and cost us opportunities to promote American exports and jobs.
- Some call for cutting spending even further. But truth is further reductions will only create bigger problems for us down road.
- My budget calls for increasing international affairs spending by \$1.4 billion. Funding increase will enable us to sustain American global leadership and continue existing programs such as trade promotion activities that generate \$15 to \$20 billion in exports each year and support more than 300,000 jobs.

UN ARREARS

- UN is important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Serves American interests in range of areas from refugee assistance, disease control and air traffic control. Its peacekeepers promote American interests around globe.
- Committed to American participation and leadership in reformed UN and to paying our financial obligations, but must insist on real reform.
- UN and member states have heard our message. UN reform primary motivation for insisting on new UN leadership -- and they understand we are committed to working with you to develop tough, but achievable, benchmarks that make UN more effective and accountable.
- Pleased with initial steps of Kofi Annan. Believe stage set for improved relations between U.S. and UN.
- Appreciate offer by Senator Lott to lead Task Force on UN Reform. Secretary Albright, OMB Director Raines and Ambassador Richardson have reported to me on progress of group.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- My last budget request is straightforward:
- UN commits to reduce future U.S. assessments to roughly amount Congress approved past two years, with no new arrears.
- With your support, USG would offer advance appropriation to cover our arrears, but it would not be available until FY 99 and would be disbursed if agreed benchmarks met.
- Your early consideration of proposal would give our diplomats leverage they need in difficult negotiations. Many nations at point they do not believe American promises to repay arrears to UN. UN members need to see legitimate offer if they are to make the reforms we demand.
- Need to get this done within next weeks to have effect on budgetary changes being considered for 1998 and 1999.

PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

- Have historic opportunity to turn nascent NIS market economies into competitive, open markets; benefits their citizens, Americans alike.
- Assistance working: two-thirds NIS under democratically elected leaders in emerging market economies; U.S. assistance can make change endure.
- Priority one is to tackle barriers to investment, fight crime, lock in economic reform, open region's vast resources to American business. Our efforts can leverage billions of dollars in trade and investment, which means jobs for Americans at home.
- Priority two is to bolster generational change, strengthen democracy; want to double people-to-people exchanges and support American foundations, volunteer groups to build civil society.
- Convinced after Helsinki time is ripe; Yeltsin committed to bold reform agenda; leaders of Ukraine, Georgia, other NIS committed to make reform irreversible.
- Entrenching democracy, market economies advances overarching national interest in seeing NIS develop as partners of America; \$900 million under Partnership for Freedom real investment in peace and security that merits bipartisan support.

CWC

Why Support the Treaty?

- Need your support for Chemical Weapons Convention.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- Last Friday, had honor of hosting broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters at White House: James Baker, Colin Powell, Paul Nitze and Ed Rowny as well as 100 other prominent, former government officials, retired military officers, veterans, business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.
- Prior to event received two important letters expressing strong support for ratification. First was from former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft and former Senators Kassebaum and Boren.
- Second letter was from 17 retired flag officers, including three former Chairmen of the JCS (Powell, Vessey, Jones), five former Service Chiefs (McPeak, Mundy, Sullivan, Zumwalt and Dugan), Norman Schwarzkopf and 8 other Generals and Admirals.
- Letters join previous letters/expressions of support from former President Bush, Larry Eagleburger, former Senator Sam Nunn and many other leading Republican and Democratic officials.
- Would like to outline some reasons why all of these people believe CWC is in our national interest.
- First, reduces chemical threat to our soldiers. Well before CWC concluded, Congress directed destruction of majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. CWC requires others do same, under strict international supervision. That is why every Chairman of JCS since the Carter Administration -- General David Jones, General John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell and General Shali -- as well as former Secretaries of Defense Melvin Laird, Harold Brown and William Perry support treaty.
- Second, our participation is tangible demonstration of international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support treaty.
- Third, treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help Intelligence Community do better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- task they face with or without CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet support treaty.
- Fourth, gives us new tools to deal with emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting flow of chemicals used to make chemical weapons, CWC makes it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Janet Reno, International Union of Police Associations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers and National Association of Police Organizations support treaty.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

- Fifth, provides level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in dual-use chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons. If we are not party, our chemical companies face CWC-mandated trade restrictions that could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales. That is why Chemical Manufacturers Association, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America support treaty.
- Finally, establishes global norm against possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, U.S. Catholic Conference, Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support treaty.
- Recognize CWC will not "solve" chemical weapons problem, but it is key element of any effective response.

Treaty Status in Senate

- Since January, have negotiated in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and group he put together in effort to address concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about treaty.
- During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached agreement on compromise or identified reasonable alternative, leaving it to Senate to decide between two.
- Will work with Majority Leader and CWC task force to facilitate Senate vote by mid-April, so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when treaty enters force.
- We have moved well beyond resolution of ratification on Senate calendar last September. Now time for Senate to vote.

Importance of April 29 Deadline

- April 29 is real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Also denied ability to require other states to do what we are already doing -- get out of chemical weapons business.
- Without ratification, credibility of American leadership across range of transnational issues undermined.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors.
- American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

FAST-TRACK

- Will seek legislation from Congress to secure fast-track authority. Every President since Ford has had fast-track authority for key periods with bipartisan Congressional support. Our choice is clear: can either move to break down barriers to our exports -- or let other countries do that for their companies and workers while we sit on sidelines.
- Trade is Increasingly Important to the Future of Our Nation. Exports have generated over one quarter of our strong economic growth over past four years. Exports support an estimated 11.3 million U.S. jobs. Over 95% of the world's consumers live outside the United States. No question our future lies with selling American products to rest of world.
- Our economy is envy of world; have nothing to fear. Over past four years, have created nearly 12 million new jobs, far more than other G-7 countries combined. We are once again world producer of autos, semiconductors. Once again largest exporter in world. Our competitors can't beat us, but we can lose if we sit on sidelines.
- American barriers are negligible compared with barriers in foreign markets. After Uruguay Round phased in, our tariffs will average 2.8%. Other countries far higher: India (31%); Turkey and Thailand (26%); Argentina, Chile and Brazil (10-11%). These are essentially one-way deals: we get more than we give up.
- Need Fast-Track Authority to Respond to Global Challenges. We need authority to conclude new trade agreements that open markets to our goods and services.
- About More than Economics. Debate about more than economics. By expanding trade, we advance cause of freedom and democracy around world. There is no better example than Latin America where democracy and open markets are on march together.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526
2018-0770-M(1.03)
02/27/2020 KDE

SEGMENT III: ASIA (Korea, China, MFN) (8:45-9:15 p.m.)

KOREA

- Security alliance with South Korea has sustained peace on Korean peninsula for forty years.
- Strength of alliance enabled us to reach agreement with North Korea on framework that freezes and eventually eliminates North Korea's nuclear program.
- KEDO, an international consortium of contributors, oversees process. Funding for KEDO and light water reactor project essential to achieving non-nuclear Korean peninsula. Look to Congress to supply funds to sustain U.S. participation in critical endeavor. (FYI: asking for \$30 million in FY 98 budget.)
- The North Koreans face severe food shortages; UN estimate shortfall between 1-2 million tons. Responding to most recent international humanitarian appeal for assistance. Distribution of assistance monitored by World Food Program. Confident food aid is being delivered to those most in need, particularly children. Appreciate Congressional support for maintaining the U.S. tradition of not using food as a tool to advance a particular political agenda.
- Because of structural problems in North Korea's economy, believe regime moving slowly toward acceptance of proposal for four-party peace talks I proposed with President Kim last April. Meeting North Koreans next week for further discussion.
- Nuclear freeze, peace talks, and our continued engagement offer best prospect for reducing tension in last outpost of Cold War.

CHINA

- China at critical turning point. Manner in which we engage China in months ahead will determine whether China becomes destabilizing threat or constructive force in Asia and world.
- Substantial U.S. interests at stake: need China's cooperation in curbing proliferation of WMD, securing permanent peace on Korean peninsula. China will become world's largest economy within 15 years; want access to that market for U.S. exports.
- Each of these interests is best served by stable, open, prosperous China that increasingly embraces international trade and nonproliferation rules.
- Continuing to engage China on number of fronts: UN Human Rights Commission resolution in Geneva, MFN renewal, and Hong Kong

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

reversion. Working with Congress we can manage our interests with China soberly and prudently. Engagement does not mean endorsement.

- Human Rights. Continue to support those in China who stand for freedom and human rights.
- Hong Kong. Future of Hong Kong remains serious concern as we approach July 1. Working with allies to ensure China understands action that allows Hong Kong's political and economic way of life to continue.
- Trade. Expect China to follow international trade rules and norms and live up to its commitments to us. Support WTO membership for China, but only on commercially meaningful terms.
- Nonproliferation. Continue to elicit Chinese support in combating proliferation; pressing China to tighten export controls and cease cooperation with such states as Iran.
- But must speak with one voice. Weakens our efforts to influence China's behavior if signals we send appear confused and conflicting. Important Congress avoid precipitous action that undermines our interests.
- Failure to extend MFN would undermine all of our interests, and reverse thirty years of bipartisan China policy. MFN revocation would curtail contacts with Chinese people; prompt increased Chinese sales of destabilizing weapons; harm Taiwan's economy; and slash Hong Kong's trade by over \$30 billion.
- Curbing our contact with China because of concerns about Hong Kong's future eliminates an important access point to Beijing decision-makers.
- Similarly staking all of our China policy solely on human rights makes human rights bilateral issue, weakening our ability to keep international spotlight on China's human rights record and keep faith with those in China who work to promote universal rights and freedoms.
- Our policy is working and urge you to help sustain it as you examine merits of MFN, evaluate soundness of Hong Kong's future and communicate importance of improving human rights.

MIDDLE EAST

Peace Process

- At very serious moment in peace process. Working hard with parties to come up with way to get them back to sustained negotiations.
- Had number of conversations with leaders from region over last two months. Main objective is to restore calm and confidence so they can return to talks.
- Arafat has to show 100% effort against terrorism. Both sides need to avoid actions that tend to preempt negotiating process.
- Will stay involved, but it's parties themselves who will have to make hard choices to make it work.

Iraq

- Would like to see Iraq reintegrated back into region and into international community -- ultimate objective.
- However, time has not come since it is abundantly clear Saddam Hussein remains danger both to region and to Iraqi people.
- Therefore, containing Saddam will remain strategic priority for Administration in second term.
- Saddam must meet all of his UN obligations, including demonstrating his peaceful intentions toward his neighbors and his people. Until then, sanctions must remain in place.

NORTHERN IRELAND

- Committed to Northern Ireland peace process; never thought it would be short or easy, given long history of conflict.
- Have extraordinary alliance with UK and close friendship with Ireland; thus able to play helpful role in supporting British and Irish efforts to get negotiating process going.
- Proud of role Senator Mitchell is playing; has won respect of all parties.
- British parliamentary election scheduled for May 1 dominating political scene in Northern Ireland as well as rest of UK.

CONFIDENTIAL

- Little expectation of breakthrough before election; situation precarious with continued IRA violence putting pressure on fragile loyalist cease-fire.
- If Blair elected, would not anticipate major change in British policy, though atmospherics could improve. Will work with him or new Major government to get peace process moving again.

Sinn Fein (if asked)

- Want to see Sinn Fein at table because inclusive talks have better chance of long-term success; but cannot happen without unequivocal cease-fire.

Loyalist cease-fire (if raised)

- Some recent attacks widely attributed to loyalist paramilitaries but loyalist command has not declared their cease-fire over, as IRA has. Better for peace process if loyalist cease-fire remains in effect.
- Belfast peace talks reconvene June 3. With election behind them, hope parties, willing to move to substantive negotiations.

Senator Mitchell (if asked)

- Senator Mitchell has said he will be there to reconvene talks in June; do not know how long he will stay as chairman.

MEXICO

- In May, will visit our closest southern neighbors as first trip of three to hemisphere. Chose Mexico, Costa Rica and Barbados to deal with issues that matter most to Americans -- economic growth, protecting environment, drugs, illegal immigration and crime.
- The United States and Mexico face serious challenge in fighting drug trafficking. Success in our efforts depends on deepened cooperation with Mexico and support for President Zedillo's efforts to reform and strengthen law enforcement.
- Intend to make improving counternarcotics cooperation top priority in my discussions with President Zedillo and other Latin American and Caribbean leaders.
- All share same objective -- keep drugs out of our neighborhoods and away from our children. Accomplishing goal requires that we work closely with other nations in hemisphere -- especially with country whose 2,000-mile border with us makes it target of traffickers seeking to smuggle contraband into United States.

CONFIDENTIAL

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- Success also requires we all do more about turning our young people away from drugs. America's drug habits are fueling trafficking and corruption in hemisphere. Hope Congress fully supports budget request for counternarcotics activities.
- Mexico undergoing profound transition, emerging from 67 years of one-party rule. Longstanding problems, like corruption, coming to light for first time. Important to support and encourage reforms that are driving change in Mexico and the reformers, like Zedillo.

ZAIRE

- Situation in Zaire remains precarious. Deeply concerned about implications of ongoing fighting. Rebels have political and military advantage. Despite our efforts to promote cease-fire, seem determined push Mobutu aside.
- Pleased peace talks resumed in South Africa under UN Special Representative Sahnoun's auspices. Doing all we can to support Sahnoun and the South Africans.
- For the sake of Zaire's future and stability, Mobutu must be persuaded to step aside gracefully in favor of inclusive, interim transitional government. That government should be mandated to organize elections with international help within a reasonable period of time.
- Such a measure would give maximum leverage to press regional states to halt all support for further military action and enable us to work together to craft mutually acceptable interim transitional government.
- Deeply concerned about plight of several hundred thousand refugees in Zaire. Worked hard to secure access to these people for international relief agencies; hope repatriation effort can begin shortly.

TERRORISM

- Worked with Congress to add \$1.1 billion to fight against terrorism.
- Also worked with Congress to pass Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act in 1996.
- Still need to fill gaps in antiterrorism bill and maintain spending for combatting terrorism.
- Administration focused on apprehending and prosecuting terrorists, protecting our troops and diplomats overseas, and

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

ensuring American cities can manage consequences of terrorist attack involving weapons of mass destruction.

- Need to continue to work together on these tasks.

ABM/TMD

- President Yeltsin and I worked hard at Helsinki to come up with mutually acceptable solution to the issue of ABM/TMD demarcation.
- Our joint statement on ABM Treaty records resolution of all outstanding demarcation issues, and commits us to explore cooperation on early warning support for TMDs, technology cooperation related to TMD, and expansion of ongoing program of cooperation in TMD exercises.
- Helsinki agreement will in no way limit U.S. TMD programs, now or in future. Under this agreement, all six U.S. TMD programs will go forward as planned.
- Moreover, by providing stable, predictable strategic environment, agreement should help facilitate Russian ratification of START II as well as further stabilizing reductions in strategic nuclear arms, such as those agreed to in the Helsinki Joint Statement on Future Reductions in Nuclear Forces.
- Administration officials prepared to brief you in greater detail on agreements reached at Helsinki, both on missile defense and nuclear arms control. Believe you will find them to be overwhelmingly in our national security interests.

Elements of Helsinki agreement (if asked)

- Basic elements include:
 - limit on velocity (five kilometers/second) and range (3,500 kilometers) of target missiles used in TMD testing;
 - ban on space-based TMD interceptors; and
 - information exchange on TMD programs,
- Sides stated they have no plans to flight test "higher velocity" TMD systems through April 1999 or to develop TMD systems with speeds exceeding certain velocities.

Space-based TMD interceptors (if pressed)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- Neither side has plans for space-based TMD interceptors. Banning space-based TMD interceptors is logical corollary to ABM Treaty's ban on space-based ABMs.

Interceptor Velocity of TMD systems (if pressed)

- Neither side has plans for TMD interceptors with velocities greater than 5.5 km/sec for land-based and air-based TMD systems, or 4.5 km/sec for sea-based TMD systems.

PROLIFERATION ISSUES

- Preventing the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and missile deliver systems remains a vital objective.
- Three central elements of our strategy.
- First, we're working with international community to strengthen international treaty regimes, especially NPT, CWC and BWC.

NPT: In May, IAEA will approve new measures to strengthen nuclear safeguards.

CWC: Timely Senate ratification essential to allow U.S. participation to set up CWC inspection regime.

BWC: Tough negotiations ahead to meet our objective of establishing legally binding compliance protocol by 1998.

- Second, dealing with consequences and motivations for proliferation in three regional "proliferation zones."

Korean peninsula: Our strategy succeeded so far. Want to keep North Korean nuclear program under control through Agreed Framework.

South Asia: No near-term solution to proliferation problem. Trying to convince India and Pakistan to maintain existing areas of restraint (e.g., no nuclear testing and missile deployment) and build closer relations with U.S. and between India and Pakistan to serve as basis for eventual solution.

Middle East: Again, no near-term political solution at hand. Making every effort to retain UN curbs on Iraq and limit programs by Iran, Syria and Libya. Need cooperation from allies and others to prevent export of dangerous technologies to Middle East.

- Third, concerted effort to work with countries that might be source of material, equipment and technology for proliferation.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

CONFIDENTIAL

Russia: Many cooperative programs underway to strengthen security of nuclear materials, combat nuclear smuggling, re-employ weapons scientists. Much remains to be done; look to Congress to maintain funding for CTR and related programs.

China: Nonproliferation is central issue in bilateral relations. Making progress on nuclear issues; hope to be able to implement peaceful nuclear cooperation soon. Still problems on chemical and missile-related exports, especially to Iran and Pakistan. We'll be working with Chinese to strengthen controls.

Reorganization (If no decision reached)

- Recognize there is great deal of speculation surrounding reorganization of foreign affairs organizations.
- Know some Members believe there must be significant change in international affairs agencies.
- As Secretary Albright has told Chairman Helms, we want to work with you on improving the coherence and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies.
- A high-level Administration working group is now concluding a careful examination of various proposals for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies.
- Working very hard developing a proposal on reorganization.
- Will forward my own proposal shortly so that we can begin more detailed discussions with you.

CONFIDENTIAL

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526
2013-0770-M(1.05)

SEGMENT I: EUROPE (6:30-7:30 P.M.) 0212712020 KDE

EUROPEAN SECURITY/NATO ENLARGEMENT

NATO enlargement priority for second term -- key test of American leadership. Requires Senate ratification, House support because of new security commitments.

Now that the Cold War is over, why place so much emphasis on Europe, expend so much energy on NATO?

- European security vital U.S. interest; through NATO adaptation, NATO enlargement, enhanced PFP, NATO-Russia and OSCE, have opportunity, for first time in history, to build secure, undivided, democratic Europe.

Won't enlargement just dilute European security?

- NATO enlargement will project stability and security into all of Europe; will strengthen and safeguard region's democratic and free-market transformation.
- Prospect of NATO membership strengthening democratic forces in Eastern Europe, weakening nationalists, promoting resolution of regional disputes (e.g., Hungary-Romania).

Aren't you letting Russia set terms of enlargement? Conversely, won't enlargement isolate Russia and threaten its democracy?

- Helsinki put NATO-Russia on track without sacrificing enlargement, which is moving forward on schedule. Russia should have a voice, but no veto.
- NATO-Russia relationship -- via Charter, formal consultative mechanism -- can bring Russia into emerging security system.

What are the costs and how did you calculate them?

- U.S. costs affordable: \$150-200M per year. Costs to new members also affordable -- as CEE governments already said.
- Current threat low. Defense of new members possible through assuring the capability for reinforcement and modernization of new members' forces.
- Therefore, NATO concluded no need to permanently station substantial NATO combat forces; no intention or need to deploy nuclear forces on soil of new members.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Reason: 1.5 (b) (d)

Declassify on: 04/11/07

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- New NATO members will be valuable, committed members. IFOR -- where Poles, Czechs, others have combat troops; Hungary supplying bases -- shows CEE will make meaningful contribution.

Why not EU enlargement vice NATO?

- EU, NATO enlargement part of same historic process. Both important, not mutually exclusive.
- EU not equipped to be lead organization for European security and integration, as Bosnia demonstrated. Key to long-term European stability is U.S. engagement and leadership, which comes only through NATO.

Will the American people support enlargement?

- Americans not isolationist: Majority (62%) support NATO enlargement to Poland, Czech, Hungary; 68% would favor defending Poland with U.S. troops.

Why enlarge NATO absent a threat?

- Need NATO enlargement for same reason we need NATO: America's core alliance in uncertain world. Cannot foresee all threats, but know preparedness deters them. Through enlargement can extend same stability to Central Europe that Western Europe enjoyed for 45 years.
- Failure to enlarge NATO would betray our traditions and America's role throughout 20th century. Must not exclude countries that have demonstrated commitment to defend our common values and to share in common burdens.

RUSSIA

Aren't the reformers fighting an uphill battle?

- Yeltsin back in charge. New team has potential to take on economic problems that overshadow everything else in Russia.
- Yeltsin showed at Helsinki ready to tackle tough issues and make decisions.
- Russian reform -- and bilateral relations -- likely be bumpy road, but overall direction positive.
- As we continue to support reform, will also maintain commitment to sovereignty and independence of other NIS, like Ukraine.

Wasn't Helsinki just an agreement to disagree on NATO?

- Summit re-energized U.S.-Russian relations.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- Turned corner on NATO enlargement. Russia opposed, but ready to develop NATO-Russia relationship. If we can get Charter nailed down, possibility of signing before Madrid.
- Important progress on arms control: START, ABM/TMD.
- Defined path to stimulate trade and investment; will bolster reform in Russia and mean new jobs for Americans.

Why are you asking for more money in your FY98 budget for assistance to the NIS?

- Bipartisan support critical, especially for FY-98 Partnership for Freedom request. Funding for Russia, NIS will promote trade and investment, lock in reforms, expand people-to-people contacts that will forge important ties with tomorrow's leaders.

BOSNIA

What have we accomplished in Bosnia other than to enforce artificial peace that will collapse when we leave?

- In summer of 1995, bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II raged. Few believed peace possible; many questioned NATO's role in post-Cold War era.
- Since then, U.S. leadership produced Dayton Accords, and revitalized NATO helped consolidate peace, providing environment for political reconciliation and economic reconstruction.
- Efforts in Bosnia have exceeded expectations:
 - Implemented military aspects of Dayton with no combat casualties; held national elections in September; created joint national institutions; returned more than 200,000 refugees.
 - U.S.-led, Train-and-Equip program building stable military balance and facilitating formation of joint defense structures.
 - Making progress on economic reconstruction, especially in Bosniak-Croat Federation. Today, Sarajevo bustles with reconstruction; hundreds of cafes, shops, banks and other commercial endeavors open.

Why didn't we call it a day when the IFOR mandate ended?

- Still have long way to go: must do more to rebuild economy, create jobs, stimulate investment. Need greater cooperation from parties on freedom of movement and return of refugees.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- Bosnian people, with help of international NGOs, must assume responsibility for building own future.
- SFOR will provide stability and confidence for Bosnian people to continue toward these goals. Withdrawal of U.S. forces in mid-1998 should give sufficient time to ensure self-sustaining peace.

Why not cut our losses and get out now?

- Early, unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops would endanger progress made since Dayton. Could lead to resumption of war with resulting crisis in NATO; would erode U.S. credibility and leadership around world.
- Strongly urge your support for our efforts in Bosnia. Stability in Europe central to U.S. interests, as is preserving U.S. leadership of strong, effective NATO as it embarks on enlargement and new partnership with Russia.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

SEGMENT II: Dinner and Discussion (8:00 - 8:45 p.m.)

RESOURCES AND REORGANIZATION

You're asking for more money for foreign affairs. What will we get out of it?

- Foreign affairs programs small part of federal budget -- about 1% of spending. But that 1% pays enormous dividends.
- Helps us to avoid wars and save lives; stems inflow of illegal drugs; helps us in war on terrorism; promotes democracy and other American values; and stimulates American exports and jobs.
- My budget calls for increasing international affairs spending by \$1.4 billion. Funding increase will enable us to sustain American global leadership and continue existing programs such as trade promotion activities that generate \$15 to \$20 billion in exports each year and support more than 300,000 jobs.

How can you be asking us to spend more on foreign affairs when we're trying to balance the budget?

- International affairs spending has fallen by roughly 20%, in real terms, over past four years. Steep decline has diminished ability to influence events overseas, raised serious questions about our willingness to remain engaged in international arena and cost us opportunities to promote American exports and jobs.
- Further reductions will create bigger problems for us down road.

UN ARREARS

Why should we throw money at a bloated bureaucracy like the U.N.?

- UN is important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Serves American interests in range of areas from refugee assistance, disease control and air traffic control. Its peacekeepers promote American interests around globe.
- Committed to American participation and leadership in reformed UN and to paying our financial obligations, but must insist on real reform.

Have you seen any signs of progress on reform?

- UN and member states have heard our message. UN reform primary motivation for insisting on new UN leadership -- and they understand we are committed to working with you to develop tough, but achievable, benchmarks that make UN more effective and accountable.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- Pleased with initial steps of Kofi Annan. Believe stage set for improved relations between U.S. and UN.
- Appreciate offer by Senator Lott to lead Task Force on UN Reform. Secretary Albright, OMB Director Raines and Ambassador Richardson have reported to me on progress of group.

What's your plan for paying our debts and dues while keeping reform on track?

- My last budget request is straightforward:
- UN commits to reduce future U.S. assessments to roughly amount Congress approved past two years, with no new arrears.
- With your support, USG would offer advance appropriation to cover our arrears, but it would not be available until FY 99 and would be disbursed if agreed benchmarks met.
- Your early consideration of proposal would give our diplomats leverage they need in difficult negotiations. Many nations at point they do not believe American promises to repay arrears to UN. UN members need to see legitimate offer if they are to make the reforms we demand.
- Need to get this done within next weeks to have effect on budgetary changes being considered for 1998 and 1999.

PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

What have we gotten out of our assistance to the NIS?

- Assistance working: two-thirds NIS under democratically elected leaders in emerging market economies; and two-thirds of Russia's economy now privatized. U.S. assistance can make change endure.

Why this new Partnership for Freedom initiative? What are the goals?

- Entrenching democracy, market economies advances overarching national interest in seeing NIS develop as partners of America; \$900 million under Partnership for Freedom real investment in peace and security that merits bipartisan support.
- Priority one is to tackle barriers to investment, fight crime, lock in economic reform, open region's vast resources to American business. Our efforts can leverage billions of dollars in trade and investment, which means jobs for Americans at home.
- Priority two is to bolster generational change, strengthen democracy; want to double people-to-people exchanges and support

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

American foundations, volunteer groups to build civil society, focus on grass roots.

- Convinced after Helsinki time is ripe; Yeltsin committed to bold reform agenda; leaders of Ukraine, Georgia, other NIS committed to make reform irreversible.

REORGANIZATION (IF NO DECISION REACHED)

Are we ever going to see a reorganization plan?

- Recognize there is great deal of speculation surrounding reorganization of foreign affairs organizations.
- Know some Members believe there must be significant change in international affairs agencies.
- As Secretary Albright has told Chairman Helms, we want to work with you on improving the coherence and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies.
- A high-level Administration working group is now concluding a careful examination of various proposals for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies. Working very hard developing a proposal on reorganization.
- Will forward my own proposal shortly so that we can begin more detailed discussions with you.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

Who Supports the Treaty?

- Ten days ago, hosted broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters at White House: James Baker, Colin Powell, Paul Nitze and Ed Rowny, 100 other prominent, former government officials, retired military officers, veterans, business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.
- Treaty has "made in America" written all over it: started by Reagan Administration, completed and signed by Bush Administration, submitted to Senate by my administration where many Republicans as well as Democrats support ratification..

Why Support the Treaty?

- First, reduces chemical threat to our soldiers. A decade ago, well before CWC concluded, Congress directed destruction of majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. CWC requires others do same, under strict international supervision. That's why every Chairman of JCS since 1976 -- General David Jones, General

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell and General Shali -- and former Secretaries of Defense Mel Laird, Harold Brown and Bill Perry -- support treaty.

- Second, our participation is tangible demonstration of international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support treaty.
- Third, treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help Intelligence Community do better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- task they face with or without CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet support treaty.
- Fourth, gives us new tools to deal with emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting flow of chemicals used to make chemical weapons, CWC makes it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Janet Reno, International Union of Police Associations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers and National Association of Police Organizations support treaty.
- Fifth, provides level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in dual-use chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons. If we are not party, our chemical companies face CWC-mandated trade restrictions that could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales. That is why Chemical Manufacturers Association, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America support treaty.
- Finally, establishes global norm against possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, U.S. Catholic Conference, Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support treaty.
- Recognize CWC will not "solve" chemical weapons problem, but it is key element of any effective response.

What is Treaty Status in Senate?

- Since January, have negotiated in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and group he put together in effort to address concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about treaty.
- During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

agreement on compromise or identified reasonable alternative, leaving it to Senate to decide between two.

- Will work with Majority Leader and CWC task force to facilitate Senate vote by mid-April, so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when treaty enters force.
- We have moved well beyond resolution of ratification on Senate calendar last September. Now time for Senate to vote.

What's the Importance of April 29 Deadline?

- April 29 is real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Also denied ability to require other states to do what we are already doing -- get out of chemical weapons business.
- Without ratification, credibility of American leadership across range of transnational issues undermined.
- The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors.
- American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

FAST-TRACK

Why do you need fast track?

- Every President since Ford has had fast-track authority for key periods with bipartisan Congressional support. Our choice is clear: can either move to break down barriers to our exports -- or let other countries do that for their companies and workers while we sit on sidelines.
- Trade is increasingly important to the future of our nation. Exports have generated over one quarter of our strong economic growth over past four years. Exports support an estimated 11.3 million U.S. jobs. Over 95% of the world's consumers live outside the United States. No question our future lies with selling American products to rest of world.
- About more than economics. Debate about more than economics. By expanding trade, we advance cause of freedom and democracy around world. There is no better example than Latin America where democracy and open markets are on march together.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

How can we and why should we compete with developing countries who pay their workers less and don't meet the same tough labor and environmental standards as our companies?

- Our economy is envy of world; have nothing to fear. Over past four years, have created nearly 12 million new jobs, far more than other G-7 countries combined. We are once again world producer of autos, semiconductors. Once again largest exporter in world. Our competitors can't beat us, but we can lose if we sit on sidelines.
- American barriers are negligible compared with barriers in foreign markets. After Uruguay Round phased in, our tariffs will average 2.8%. Other countries far higher: India (31%); Turkey and Thailand (26%); Argentina, Chile and Brazil (10-11%). These are essentially one-way deals: we get more than we give up.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

SEGMENT III: ASIA (Korea, China, MFN) (8:45-9:15 p.m.)

KOREA

What is the status of North Korea's nuclear program?

- With help of our allies South Korea and Japan, reached agreement with North Korea on framework that freezes production of nuclear material and eventually eliminates North Korea's nuclear program.
- KEDO, an international consortium of contributors, oversees process. Funding for KEDO and light water reactor project essential to achieving non-nuclear Korean peninsula. Overwhelming bulk of funding picked up by Japan, South Korea. Look to Congress to supply funds to sustain U.S. participation in critical endeavor. (FYI: asking for \$30 million in FY 98 budget.)

What are we doing about the signs of starvation in North Korea?

- The North Koreans face severe food shortages; UN estimate shortfall between 1-2 million tons. We are reviewing appropriate response to most recent international humanitarian appeal for assistance. Distribution of assistance monitored by World Food Program. Confident food aid is being delivered to those most in need, particularly children. Appreciate Congressional support for maintaining the U.S. tradition of not using food as a tool to advance a particular political agenda.

What is the status of the four party peace talks?

- Hope that North Korea may now be ready to accept proposal for four-party peace talks I proposed with President Kim last April. Meeting North Koreans next week for further discussion.
- Also seeking progress on MIA's, missile proliferation.

CHINA

What is there to engage over with China -- aren't our differences so basic and fundamental that your policy is meaningless?

- China's future has an enormous impact on our interests. Manner in which we engage China in months ahead will affect whether China becomes destabilizing threat or constructive force in Asia and world.
- Substantial U.S. interests at stake: need China's cooperation in curbing proliferation of WMD, securing permanent peace on Korean peninsula, alien smuggling, counternarcotics. China will become world's largest economy within 15 years; want access to that market for U.S. exports.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- Each of these interests is best served by stable, open, prosperous China that increasingly embraces international trade and nonproliferation rules. Isolating or containing China counterproductive. Want to work with Congress to forge common strategy.

Doesn't engagement come at the expense of our principles?

- Engagement does not mean endorsement. Working with Congress we can manage our interests with China soberly and prudently.
 - Human Rights. Continue to support those in China who stand for freedom and human rights. Sponsored resolution in Geneva.
 - Hong Kong. Future of Hong Kong remains serious concern as we approach July 1. Working with allies to ensure China understands action that allows Hong Kong's political and economic way of life to continue.
 - Trade. Expect China to follow international trade rules and norms and live up to its commitments to us. Support WTO membership for China, but only on commercially meaningful terms.
 - Nonproliferation. Continue to elicit Chinese support in combating proliferation; pressing China to tighten export controls and cease cooperation with such states as Iran.

Why should we extend MFN?

- Failure to extend MFN would undermine all of our interests, and reverse thirty years of bipartisan China policy. MFN revocation would not lead to improve human rights or better non-proliferation record; but would damage not only U.S. jobs but also Taiwan's economy and slash Hong Kong's trade by over \$30 billion.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

Q+A'S

SEGMENT I: EUROPE (6:30-7:30 P.M.)

EUROPEAN SECURITY/NATO ENLARGEMENT

- NATO enlargement ~~top~~ priority for second term -- key test of American leadership. Requires Senate ratification, House support because of new security commitments.
- European security vital U.S. interest; through NATO, ^{adaptation} NATO enlargement ~~and~~ NATO-Russia, have opportunity, for first time in history, to ^{enhanced CFP PPP, and OSCE} build secure, undivided, democratic Europe.
- NATO enlargement will project stability and security into all of Europe; will strengthen and safeguard region's democratic and free-market transformation.
- Prospect of NATO membership strengthening democratic forces in Eastern Europe, weakening nationalists, promoting resolution of regional disputes (e.g., Hungary-Romania).
- ~~Won't let Russian pressure speak us. Had we taken initial Russian "no" in 1989, Germany would not be reunited today. Won't bring Russia in by keeping other democracies out.~~
- Helsinki put NATO-Russia on track without sacrificing enlargement, which is moving forward on schedule. ^{Want to involve Russia, but no vetoes}
- NATO-Russia relationship -- via Charter, formal consultative mechanism -- can bring Russia into emerging security system.

Costs/Robust NATO Posture

- ^{capab. of capability for} Current threat low. Defense of new members possible through ^{assuring the} reinforcement and modernization of new members' forces.
- Therefore, NATO concluded no need to permanently station substantial NATO combat forces; no intention or need to deploy nuclear forces on soil of new members.
- U.S. costs affordable: \$150-200M per year. Costs to new members also affordable -- as CEE governments already said.
- New NATO members will be valuable, committed members. IFOR -- where Poles, Czechs, others have combat troops; Hungary supplying bases -- shows CEE will make meaningful contribution.

Why not EU enlargement vice NATO? (if raised)

- EU, NATO enlargement part of same historic process. Both important, not mutually exclusive.

Need points
on the "who"
AP South/ESDI

- EU not equipped to be lead organization for European security and integration, as Bosnia demonstrated. Key to long-term European stability is U.S. engagement and leadership, which comes only through NATO.

American people don't support (if raised)

- Americans not isolationist: Majority (62%) support NATO enlargement to Poland, Czech, Hungary; 68% would favor defending Poland with U.S. troops.

Why enlarge NATO absent a threat? (if raised)

- Need NATO enlargement for same reason we need NATO: America's core alliance in uncertain world. Cannot foresee all threats, but know preparedness deters them. Through enlargement can extend same stability to Central Europe that Western Europe enjoyed for 45 years.
- Failure to enlarge NATO would betray our traditions and America's role throughout 20th century. Must not exclude countries that have demonstrated commitment to defend our common values and to share in common burdens.

RUSSIA

R+As

- Supporting development of democracy and market economy in Russia profoundly in America's interest -- one of my highest foreign policy priorities.
- Have historic opportunity to convert adversarial relationship into partnership for 21st century.
- Yeltsin back in charge. New team has potential to take on economic problems that overshadow everything else in Russia.
- Yeltsin showed at Helsinki ready to tackle tough issues and make decisions. Summit reenergized U.S.-Russian relations.
 - Important progress on arms control: START, ABM/TMD.
 - Turned corner on NATO enlargement. Russia opposed, but ready to develop NATO-Russia relationship.
 - Defined path to stimulate trade and investment; will bolster reform in Russia and mean new jobs for Americans.
- Russian reform -- and bilateral relations - likely be bumpy road, but overall direction positive.
- Also committed to sovereignty and independence of other NIS, like Ukraine.
- Bipartisan support critical, especially for FY-98 Partnership for Freedom request. Funding for Russia, NIS will promote trade and investment, lock in reforms, expand people-to-people contacts that will forge important ties with tomorrow's leaders.

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY
If we can get cluster mailed down, possibility of signing before Madrid
If we can get cluster mailed down, possibility of signing before Madrid

Q+A's

BOSNIA

- Difficult challenge of building lasting peace in Bosnia continues. Must not forget enormous progress made.
- In summer of 1995, bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II raged. Few believed peace possible; many questioned NATO's role in post-Cold War era.
- Since then, U.S. leadership produced Dayton Accords, and revitalized NATO helped consolidate peace, providing environment for political reconciliation and economic reconstruction.
- Efforts in Bosnia have exceeded expectations:
 - Implemented military aspects of Dayton with no combat casualties; held national elections in September; created joint national institutions; returned more than 200,000 refugees.
 - U.S.-led, Train-and-Equip program building stable military balance and facilitating formation of joint defense structures.
 - Making progress on economic reconstruction, especially in Bosniak-Croat Federation. Today, Sarajevo bustles with reconstruction; hundreds of cafes, shops, banks and other commercial endeavors open.
- Still have long way to go: must do more to rebuild economy, create jobs, stimulate investment. Need greater cooperation from parties on freedom of movement and return of refugees.
- Bosnian people, with help of international NGOs, must assume responsibility for building own future.
- SFOR will provide stability and confidence for Bosnian people to continue toward these goals. Withdrawal of U.S. forces in mid-1998 should give sufficient time to ensure self-sustaining peace.
- Early, unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops would endanger progress made since Dayton. Could lead to resumption of war with resulting crisis in NATO; would erode U.S. credibility and leadership around world.
- Strongly urge your support for our efforts in Bosnia. Stability in Europe central to U.S. interests, as is preserving U.S. leadership of strong, effective NATO as it embarks on enlargement and new partnership with Russia.

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526
2013-0710-M(1.10)
02/27/2020 KOE

SEGMENT II: (8:00 - 8:45 p.m.)

Q. A. 11

150 RESOURCES

- Foreign affairs programs small part of federal budget -- about 1% of spending. But that 1% is perhaps most important parts of budget. *pays enormous dividends*
pays enormous dividends
- Helps us to avoid wars and save lives; stems inflow of illegal drugs; helps us in war on terrorism; promotes democracy and other American values; and stimulates American exports and jobs.
- International affairs spending has fallen by roughly 20%, in real terms, over past four years. Steep decline has diminished ability to influence events overseas, raised serious questions about our willingness to remain engaged in international arena and cost us opportunities to promote American exports and jobs.
- Some call for cutting spending even further. But truth is further reductions will only create bigger problems for us down road.
- My budget calls for increasing international affairs spending by \$1.4 billion. Funding increase will enable us to sustain American global leadership and continue existing programs such as trade promotion activities that generate \$15 to \$20 billion in exports each year and support more than 300,000 jobs.

UN ARREARS

- UN is important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Serves American interests in range of areas from refugee assistance, disease control and air traffic control. Its peacekeepers promote American interests around globe.
- Committed to American participation and leadership in reformed UN and to paying our financial obligations, but must insist on real reform.
- UN and member states have heard our message. UN reform primary motivation for insisting on new UN leadership -- and they understand we are committed to working with you to develop tough, but achievable, benchmarks that make UN more effective and accountable.
- Pleased with initial steps of Kofi Annan. Believe stage set for improved relations between U.S. and UN.
- Appreciate offer by Senator Lott to lead Task Force on UN Reform. Secretary Albright, OMB Director Raines and Ambassador Richardson have reported to me on progress of group.
- My last budget request is straightforward:

CONFIDENTIAL

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- UN commits to reduce future U.S. assessments to roughly amount Congress approved past two years, with no new arrears.
- With your support, USG would offer advance appropriation to cover our arrears, but it would not be available until FY 99 and would be disbursed if agreed benchmarks met.
- Your early consideration of proposal would give our diplomats leverage they need in difficult negotiations. Many nations at point they do not believe American promises to repay arrears to UN. UN members need to see legitimate offer if they are to make the reforms we demand.
- Need to get this done within next weeks to have effect on budgetary changes being considered for 1998 and 1999.

PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

- Have historic opportunity to turn nascent NIS market economies into competitive, open markets; benefits their citizens, Americans alike.
- Assistance working: two-thirds NIS under democratically elected leaders in emerging market economies; U.S. assistance can make change endure.
- Priority one is to tackle barriers to investment, fight crime, lock in economic reform, open region's vast resources to American business. Our efforts can leverage billions of dollars in trade and investment, which means jobs for Americans at home.
- Priority two is to bolster generational change, strengthen democracy; want to double people-to-people exchanges and support American foundations, volunteer groups to build civil society.
- Convinced after Helsinki time is ripe; Yeltsin committed to bold reform agenda; leaders of Ukraine, Georgia, other NIS committed to make reform irreversible.
- Entrenching democracy, market economies advances overarching national interest in seeing NIS develop as partners of America; \$900 million under Partnership for Freedom real investment in peace and security that merits bipartisan support.

*focus
on on
gross gr
roots/NOT*

CWC

Why Support the Treaty?

- Need your support for Chemical Weapons Convention.
- Last Friday, had honor of hosting broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters at White House: James Baker, Colin Powell, Paul Nitze and Ed Rowley as well as 100 other prominent, former

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

government officials, retired military officers, veterans, business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.

- Prior to event received two important letters expressing strong support for ratification. First was from former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft and former Senators Kassebaum and Boren.
- Second letter was from 17 retired flag officers, including three former Chairmen of the JCS (Powell, Vessey, Jones), five former Service Chiefs (McPeak, Mundy, Sullivan, Zumwalt and Dugan), Norman Schwarzkopf and 8 other Generals and Admirals.
- Letters join previous letters/expressions of support from former President Bush, Larry Eagleburger, former Senator Sam Nunn and many other leading Republican and Democratic officials.
- Would like to outline some reasons why all of these people believe CWC is in our national interest.
- First, reduces chemical threat to our soldiers. Well before CWC concluded, Congress directed destruction of majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. CWC requires others do same, under strict international supervision. That is why every Chairman of JCS since the Carter Administration -- General David Jones, General John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell and General Shali -- as well as former Secretaries of Defense Melvin Laird, Harold Brown and William Perry support treaty.
- Second, our participation is tangible demonstration of international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support treaty.
- Third, treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help Intelligence Community do better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- task they face with or without CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet support treaty.
- Fourth, gives us new tools to deal with emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting flow of chemicals used to make chemical weapons, CWC makes it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Janet Reno, International Union of Police Associations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers and National Association of Police Organizations support treaty.
- Fifth, provides level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in dual-use chemicals that can be used to make

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

chemical weapons. If we are not party, our chemical companies face CWC-mandated trade restrictions that could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales. That is why Chemical Manufacturers Association, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America support treaty.

- Finally, establishes global norm against possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, U.S. Catholic Conference, Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support treaty.
- Recognize CWC will not "solve" chemical weapons problem, but it is key element of any effective response.

*What
LIT*

Treaty Status in Senate

- Since January, have negotiated in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and group he put together in effort to address concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about treaty.
- During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached agreement on compromise or identified reasonable alternative, leaving it to Senate to decide between two.
- Will work with Majority Leader and CWC task force to facilitate Senate vote by mid-April, so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when treaty enters force.
- We have moved well beyond resolution of ratification on Senate calendar last September. Now time for Senate to vote.

*What
is*

Importance of April 29 Deadline

- April 29 is real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Also denied ability to require other states to do what we are already doing -- get out of chemical weapons business.
- Without ratification, credibility of American leadership across range of transnational issues undermined.
- The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors.
- American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

FAST-TRACK

- Will seek legislation from Congress to secure fast-track authority. Every President since Ford has had fast-track authority for key periods with bipartisan Congressional support. Our choice is clear: can either move to break down barriers to our exports -- or let other countries do that for their companies and workers while we sit on sidelines.
- Trade is Increasingly Important to the Future of Our Nation. Exports have generated over one quarter of our strong economic growth over past four years. Exports support an estimated 11.3 million U.S. jobs. Over 95% of the world's consumers live outside the United States. No question our future lies with selling American products to rest of world.
- Our economy is envy of world; have nothing to fear. Over past four years, have created nearly 12 million new jobs, far more than other G-7 countries combined. We are once again world producer of autos, semiconductors. Once again largest exporter in world. Our competitors can't beat us, but we can lose if we sit on sidelines.
- American barriers are negligible compared with barriers in foreign markets. After Uruguay Round phased in, our tariffs will average 2.8%. Other countries far higher: India (31%); Turkey and Thailand (26%); Argentina, Chile and Brazil (10-11%). These are essentially one-way deals: we get more than we give up.
- Need Fast-Track Authority to Respond to Global Challenges. We need authority to conclude new trade agreements that open markets to our goods and services.
- About More than Economics. Debate about more than economics. By expanding trade, we advance cause of freedom and democracy around world. There is no better example than Latin America where democracy and open markets are on march together.

(J n A)

ASIA (Korea, China, MFN) (8:45-9:15 p.m.) SEGMENT III

KOREA

- Security alliance with South Korea has sustained peace on Korean peninsula for forty years. *production of nuclear material*
- Strength of alliance enabled us to reach agreement with North Korea on framework that freezes and eventually eliminates North Korea's nuclear program. *production of nuclear material*
- KEDO, an international consortium of contributors, oversees process. Funding for KEDO and light water reactor project essential to achieving non-nuclear Korean peninsula. Look to Congress to supply funds to sustain U.S. participation in critical endeavor. (FYI: asking for \$30 million in FY 98 budget.) *We are We are review appropriate*
- The North Koreans face severe food shortages; UN estimate shortfall between 1-2 million tons. Responding to most recent international humanitarian appeal for assistance. Distribution of assistance monitored by World Food Program. Confident food aid is being delivered to those most in need, particularly children. Appreciate Congressional support for maintaining the U.S. tradition of not using food as a tool to advance a particular political agenda. *Hope that North Korea may now be ready to*
- ~~Because of structural problems in North Korea's economy, believe regime moving slowly toward acceptance of proposal for four-party peace talks I proposed with President Kim last April. Meeting North Koreans next week for further discussion.~~ *Hope that North Korea may now be ready to*
- Nuclear freeze, peace talks, and our continued engagement offer best prospect for reducing tension in last outpost of Cold War. *Also seeing progress on MIDs, missile proliferation*

CHINA

- ~~China at critical turning point. Manner in which we engage China in months ahead will determine whether China becomes destabilizing threat or constructive force in Asia and world.~~ *future has an enormous impact on our interests*
- Substantial U.S. interests at stake: need China's cooperation in curbing proliferation of WMD, securing permanent peace on Korean peninsula. China will become world's largest economy within 15 years; want access to that market for U.S. exports. *future has an enormous impact on our interests*
- Each of these interests is best served by stable, open, prosperous China that increasingly embraces international trade and nonproliferation rules. *Also have important areas of diff. with China*
- ~~Continuing to engage China on number of fronts: UN Human Rights Commission resolution in Geneva, MFN renewal, and Hong Kong reversion.~~ Working with Congress we can manage our interests with

*alien smuggling
Alien Smuggling
Counter-Narcotics
Counter-narcotics*

China soberly and prudently. Engagement does not mean endorsement.

[~~Withdraw~~ Sponsored resolution in Geneva
Sponsored resolution in Geneva

- Human Rights. Continue to support those in China who stand for freedom and human rights.
- Hong Kong. Future of Hong Kong remains serious concern as we approach July 1. Working with allies to ensure China understands action that allows Hong Kong's political and economic way of life to continue.
- Trade. Expect China to follow international trade rules and norms and live up to its commitments to us. Support WTO membership for China, but only on commercially meaningful terms.

- Nonproliferation. Continue to elicit Chinese support in combating proliferation; pressing China to tighten export controls and cease cooperation with such states as Iran.

Isolating

- ~~But must speak with one voice. Weakens our efforts to influence China's behavior if signals we send appear confused and conflicting. Important Congress avoid precipitous action that undermines our interests.~~ *Contain China counterproductive. Wait to wait with Congress to large countries sticks*

- Failure to extend MFN would undermine all of our interests, and reverse thirty years of bipartisan China policy. MFN revocation ~~would curtail contacts with Chinese people; prompt increased Chinese sales of destabilizing weapons; harm Taiwan's economy; and slash Hong Kong's trade by over \$30 billion.~~

(?)

- Curbing our contact with China because of concerns about Hong Kong's future eliminates an important access point to Beijing decision-makers.
- Similarly staking all of our China policy solely on human rights makes human rights bilateral issue, weakening our ability to keep international spotlight on China's human rights record and keep faith with those in China who work to promote universal rights and freedoms.
- Our policy is working and urge you to help sustain it as you examine merits of MFN, evaluate soundness of Hong Kong's future and communicate importance of improving human rights.

~~Wants to return to MFN~~
~~should be MFN~~
So seek to

Would not lead to improved human rights or better non-proliferation record; but would damage not only U.S. jobs but also

3 Qs

- stakes
- Purpose
- Happens after

- ① strike
- ② can we take the / or on crime
- ③ Purpose
- ④ long term

Stakes

- History of SH
- Now, say, certain plus the with go (9/18)
- Big Sites
- 700 building
- UNSW member (City Orgznt.)
- Conti office of Spaul ~~and~~ - Not just possible
has - large city-sided complexes.
- Essential to her

We know

- we know he has capacity left in spite of UNSW's
cont.

- If he succeeds here, he will keep going.

If we do not respond, we have no M.O. He
will move again. Will draw lesson have lost
one hill - Only our will has stopped him

92, '93 ⇒ eg 5 of / / / /

We have to
We have stopped from - Be threat to our
intl. stgy interest.

Now: intention to take control of region of
cross economic impact - We know he has WMP
he will use if he don't deny from capability. We
cannot tolerate that.

Purpose

Prefer diplo
Albright, Cohen, Rubin - not by armed world
to get FF
Best solution: UNSCOM m. Continue to
do work
Continue to pursue option till the very end.
But only if he, when we are resolved is there
any other hell name war.
Let them be no mist. The pros
is Resolute, the will act.

Goal

Deliver powerful plan

If we cannot have inspectors, we will do
by making sure that we can by

military means.

I am convinced we cannot, should not eliminate it all - But can do lots of things.

Hopefully, as result, I will never have to let UN down
but if not

- ① Take out Saddam's assets.
- ② Prepare to cut off oil if he reverts to the

Can we sustain strike with minor SA from power.

NO - military would require 100,000 of Gulf bases, US can do.

Strategic benefit of doing this by military means does not justify cost.

Our well interests! WMD capacity + threat (preventing WMD or hosting airplanes)

- What happens after 6 months?

- degraded WMD capacity to the high

- Sanctions

- increased deterrence - Unlike actions appropriate below (Response intended to offend)

he will know if he knows it, he will pay
a debt / heavy price

(no decision, massive, destiny)
we cannot know what jobs on m
~~of the~~ ~~being~~ ~~any~~ ~~based~~, what UNSCOM does based
on intell. - will still have intell.

Covert action

↳ invite people who hate him (Kurds, Sunnis, Shiite)
to go on war path

Try as well as possible
recognize alt. govt
propaganda

↳ if we decide strike today, we lose 1/2 our allies.

↳ Most important: pretext for strike

↳ What's your strategy

↳ Cost > benefit > probability

I want to address three.

UNSWorn

Can't go to uncheck # of compl.

BA it's 5×10 mls - the 5mg a/X

700 daily.

one mg Amel.

BA with in other 699.

Not a w/and not.

Gray, Wendy E.

From: Countryman, Thomas M.
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 1998 1:49 PM
To: @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Cc: @NESASIA - NE/South Asia; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Subject: FW: SRB Iraq Speech [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Tony: If it helps: One other line you can insert which can be documented:

"Prior to 1996, the regime was spending annually at least a few hundred million dollars, from hidden bank accounts and smuggled oil, on import of humanitarian supplies. As soon as 986 implementation began, it stopped using any of its own resources on food and medicine."

-----Original Message-----

From: Countryman, Thomas M.
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 1998 12:31 PM
To: @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Cc: @NESASIA - NE/South Asia; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Subject: FW: SRB Iraq Speech [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Rob for info.

Tony: see the changes I made on page 7 below.

CIa confirms that their estimate ("the palaces cost an equivalent of \$1.5 to 2 billion") is based on the regional contractors' cost for equivalent palaces. It has no way to estimate how much of that was in hard currency and how much in sub-living wages to Iraqi laborers. You should assume that the construction workers were paid much less than the Koreans who used to put up palaces in Baghdad and still do in Saudi, etc.

All of which makes me uncomfortable with equating the \$1b. to xx tons of baby formula. It gives the GOI an opportunity to distract from the overall message of SRB's speech with a plausible argument about one statistic. The sentence I inserted refers only to documented hard-currency purchases by the regime and is a safer (admittedly, less dramatic) way to do.

-----Original Message-----

From: Cooper, Kathleen H.
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 1998 9:06 AM
To: @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Cc: @NESASIA - NE/South Asia
Subject: FW: SRB Iraq Speech [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

More fixes from Bruce in revisions.

-----Original Message-----

From: Blinken, Antony J.
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 1998 11:10 PM
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor; @NESASIA - NE/South Asia; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm; @WHSR - WH Situation Room
Subject: SRB Iraq Speech [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High



SRBIRAQ4.DOC

[Sit Room: Please put in a.m. take for Mssrs. Berger and Steinberg. Thank you.]

Revised draft following discussion with SRB. Bruce/Joe, please note queries denoted by [TK]. Need to try and work answers ASAP. Thanks.

2/11/98 11 p.m.

IRAQ AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST
SAMUEL R. BERGER
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
WASHINGTON, D.C.
FEBRUARY XX, 1998

My challenge today is to resist the tyranny of the news cycle and put the current crisis with Iraq in context. I want to make clear the danger Saddam Hussein poses to his people, his neighbors, America and the world. I want to explain what we're doing about it -- in terms of the current crisis over Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program. And I want to lay out our long term strategy for dealing with the chronic problem that is Saddam Hussein.

has been and continues to be

Throughout his time in power ^(since 195x) Saddam has demonstrated ^{time and} ~~ever and over~~ again contempt for his people, the peace of his region and the security of the world. He pursued a horrific, decade-long war of attrition against Iran ^{costing} that cost [TK] lives. He unleashed chemical weapons against Iran's soldiers. ^{In 19xx,} He gassed Kurdish civilians in Northern Iraq, killing [TK]. ^{In 19907 his} His troops invaded Kuwait, executing those who resisted, looting the country, setting fire to dozens of oil wells, spilling millions of gallons of oil into the Gulf, firing SCUD missiles at Tel Aviv, Riyadh and Manama. At war's end, he brutally put down the Kurds and Marsh Arabs who rose up in revolt against him. He ordered an attempt on the life of former President Bush. Once again in 1994, he massed his army along the Kuwaiti border. He forcefully occupied Irbil ^{in Northern Iraq} in 1996. And throughout, Saddam has ^{continued} ~~attempted~~ to develop the most terrible weapons known to humanity -- nuclear, chemical and biological -- and the missiles to deliver them.

The United States has actively opposed Saddam because ^{he has demonstrated the intent to} ~~his reckless acts~~ threaten the stability of a region vital to our interests -- and ultimately the security of every American. ~~Nothing is more~~

to use whatever instruments are available to him

[pronounced →]

this region of vital interest to the U.S.

in his own country

That threat is particularly insidious when it comes in the form of ~~reckless~~ or more of a threat to our interests -- than Iraq's pursuit of weapons of mass

destruction. As President Clinton has said, the spread of these weapons, ~~to outlaw states,~~ including from outlaw states like Iraq to terrorists and international criminals, is one of the most dangerous security threats all our people

will face ~~in~~ ^{over} the next generation. Many countries have nuclear, biological ~~and~~ or chemical weapons. ~~With Saddam, we're dealing with a repeat offender. He has used poison gas against Iran. He has used it against his own people. He terrorized his neighbors and Israel with weapons of mass destruction during the Gulf War. We must do everything we can to prevent him from threatening the world with these weapons again.~~ But we SH there is one big difference he has used them. Not just once but twice. And I have no doubt he will use them again if we let him rebuild his capacity rebuild is left unfettered.

For the better part of this decade, the international community has worked to discover and dismantle Iraq's WMD program. At the end of the Gulf War, Iraq was given 15 days to inventory and begin the destruction of its nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. The U.N. set up a special commission of experts, (called) UNSCOM, to make sure that the job got done -- and to monitor the situation so that Iraq did not reconstitute its program.

Ever since, Iraq's WMD compliance record had been one long litany of lies, deceit and run-arounds. Baghdad took five years to deliver the full disclosure document on missiles it was required to produce in fifteen days. It amended its biological, chemical and nuclear weapons reports multiple times when UNSCOM and the International Atomic Energy Agency uncovered facts that proved the reports to be grossly inaccurate. When Hussein Kamel -- Saddam's son-in-law and the architect of Iraq's WMD program -- defected to Jordan in 1995 (ch), Baghdad was forced to make presumptive revelations of weapons stockpiles and production capacity it had insisted it did not have. Throughout, Baghdad has engaged the UNSCOM inspectors in a high stakes game of

cat-and-mouse -- lying to them, harassing them, delaying their access to sites, flagrantly removing or destroying evidence just ahead of the inspectors.

Yet despite
~~Despite~~ Iraq's best efforts, the inspectors have done a remarkable job. They have found and destroyed more of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capacity than was destroyed during the Gulf War itself. This includes 38,000 chemical weapons, more than 100,000 gallons of the chemical weapons agents, 48 operational missiles, 30 warheads specially fitted for chemical and biological weapons, and a massive biological weapons factory at Al-Hakim equipped to produce deadly anthrax and botulinum.

But UNSCOM's job is not yet done. Iraq retains stockpiles of chemical and biological munitions. A small force of Scud-type missiles remains unaccounted for. And most *importantly,* ~~significantly,~~ Iraq still has the *capacity* ~~ability to quickly~~ rebuild its production program for biological and chemical weapons and the missiles to deliver them. As UNSCOM has ~~gotten~~ *(come)* closer and closer to ferreting out Iraq's remaining weapons capacity, Saddam has become increasingly *determined* ~~desperate~~ in his efforts to block the inspectors and end the inspection regime.

Which brings us to the current crisis. Over the last three months, Saddam has sought to end UNSCOM by any and every ruse. First he demanded that American inspectors be removed from the inspection teams. Then he tried to dictate a change in the teams' composition. Now he is denying UNSCOM the free and full access it must have to all sites by designating some of the most suspect "Presidential Palaces." One such "palace" is in fact a compound X by Y miles -- roughly the size of the District of Columbia [TK]. It encompasses some 700 separate buildings.

[One] of them may well a presidential ^{residence} ~~retreat~~. But that leaves another [699] for him to cheat the inspections system.

At the same time, Saddam is ^(keeping) lobbying to end the sanctions imposed by the United Nations ^{after the war} ~~to~~ ^{and which should not be lifted until he complies with all UN resolutions,} ~~compel his cooperation with UNSCOM.~~ His gambit is clear and presents a stark danger to our ^{including} ~~rise~~ ^{or} ~~wind.~~ vital national interests. Compromise UNSCOM's integrity by imposing debilitating conditions on the inspectors and Saddam keeps his remaining weapons of mass destruction and the capacity to ~~quickly~~ produce many more of them. Lift the sanctions and Saddam gets the money he needs to rebuild his military. It is not a situation we can tolerate.

We cannot let Saddam succeed. ^{If he defies the international controls here with impunity he will} ~~Give him an inch and he'll take an arm. And he will draw the~~ ~~And he will be right~~ lesson that we've lost our will. Only our will has stopped him before. The will ^{of President Bush} to lead the Gulf War coalition that ejected Iraq from Kuwait and imposed tough conditions for the cease-fire.

^{of President Clinton} The will to strike hard at Iraqi intelligence headquarters in 1993 after its agents plotted to assassinate former President Bush. The will to immediately deploy our troops, ships and planes to the region, as President Clinton did in 1996 when Saddam threatened to repeat his walkover of Kuwait. The will to take out Iraqi air defenses and extend the No Fly Zone in the South when Saddam forcefully occupied Irbil in the North.

once again, Now, we must summon the will to turn back Saddam's challenge to UNSCOM and contain his ^{of our friends, allies} ~~capacity~~ ^{And that is what we are doing.} ~~We are.~~ Far from dividing the world, ^{Many would prefer a diplomatic solution whereby UNSCOM would be allowed to do its work without restriction. So would we} ~~destroying UNSCOM or diluting the sanctions, Saddam has forged unanimity on these core~~ But there also is widespread consensus ^{that} ~~that~~ ^{that} Iraq must meet all its obligations to the United Nations, ~~and~~ UNSCOM must be allowed

He will roll on, as he has before, energized by the conclusion that the international community will not act.

That points

That

UNSCOM would be allowed to do its work without restriction. So would we

And that, if diplomacy fails, SH will bear to do its job without condition. ~~The only light at the end of the tunnel for Saddam is full~~ ~~the responsibility for the consequences.~~ ~~compliance with the will of the international community.~~

Successful diplomacy remains the best answer --

~~The best way to prevent Saddam from threatening the world with weapons of mass destruction is --~~

UNSCOM
to get the inspectors back on the job with unfettered access to every suspect site. The

UNSCOM system works -- that's why Saddam is so desperate to end it. We will spare no effort

~~to secure a genuine diplomatic solution.~~ ~~That's why the President has been on the phone with~~

~~many~~ of his counterparts nearly every day for the past week. That's why he dispatched

Secretary Albright and Secretary Cohen to Europe and the Middle East -- and Ambassador

Richardson literally around the world. If there is a peaceful way to convince Saddam to let

UNSCOM complete its mission, we will pursue it until the ~~25th hour.~~ ~~end.~~

But if UNSCOM cannot do its job effectively, as Chairman Butler has said,

~~But if the inspectors remain holed up in a hotel in Baghdad, they may as well be in Bahrain. If~~

~~they are not allowed to do their job, we must be prepared, and we are, to deal directly with the~~

threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction -- with force if necessary. Let there be no

~~mistake. This President is resolute. He will act.~~

~~resolution to UNSCOM's restricted~~ ~~access, we will act.~~

because of these restrictions,

For the past several weeks, the United States has built up its forces in the Gulf. As I speak, two

American carrier battle groups and over 300 aircraft are in the region. They are joined by the

British aircraft carrier Invincible. And we continue to ~~receive~~ ~~receive~~ support for action, should it prove

necessary. ~~There are differences over tactics.~~ Some of our friends have more ~~faith in~~ ~~faith in~~ ~~diplomacy~~

than we do. But every country we have talked to -- in Europe, the Persian Gulf, the Middle

East, Africa and Latin America -- agrees that Saddam has caused this crisis and must fully

comply with the U.N. resolutions. And many friends and allies -- including Britain, Germany, Australia and Canada -- are prepared to take part in a military mission.

give whole list so far. Many more considering BR

Should such a mission prove necessary, its purpose is clear: to deliver a ^{serious} powerful body blow that will ^{significantly} substantially diminish Saddam's capacity to rebuild his weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them, and reduce his ability to threaten his neighbors. That is the objective we can and must meet to protect our vital national interests.

If, in the aftermath of force, Iraq allows UNSCOM back in, so much the better. Certainly, it will have experienced a powerful incentive to do so. ~~But whether or not the inspectors return, let me say a few words about how the world will look to Saddam in the days, weeks and months after force is used.~~

years ahead that SH is seeking to reconstitute his mind, we must be prepared to act again

First, as I noted a minute ago, ~~any use of force will substantially diminish Iraq's capacity to develop and deliver weapons of mass destruction and to lash out at its neighbors.~~ Simply put, if

will be significantly diminished.

second, ~~we use force, it will be effective.~~ And Saddam will know, by our actions and our warning, that we will be back if he ~~tries to~~ begins to rebuild those capabilities. Second, sanctions will remain in place indefinitely because only UNSCOM can fully verify Third, Iraq's compliance with its obligation to dismantle its WMD program. Sanctions hurt. The proof

can be found in Saddam's desperate attempts to weasel out of them. They severely restrict the amount of oil Iraq can sell and give the United Nations control over Iraq's primary source of revenue. To date, sanctions have cost Iraq \$110 billion in oil sales. Imagine the armed force Saddam would have today had he invested even a fraction of this money in rehabilitating his military.

the Iraqi regime

And I have confidence in our ability to detect [significant] [cheating W/CIA] [check] [substantial]

(P) P8

The Iraqi regime,
 Sanctions are aimed ~~at Saddam~~, not the Iraqi people. From the start, we exempted food and medicine. To help Iraq generate revenue to pay for ~~the~~ ^{such} food and medicine, ~~it is allowed to buy,~~
 the United States in 1991, proposed U.N. Security Council Resolutions 706 and 712. They ^{would have} allowed Iraq to sell limited amounts of oil and use the proceeds for humanitarian supplies -- subject to U.N. monitoring.

for five years,
 For ~~five years~~, Saddam rejected that offer, in effect ~~taking food from his people's tables and~~ ^{holding his own people hostage} ~~medicine from their hospitals~~ -- while spending what resources he had ~~secreted away~~ on lavish palaces, the military and his weapons of mass destruction program. Consider: the 48 palaces Saddam has built since the Gulf War cost over \$1 billion. That's the equivalent of [TK: translate into foodstuffs and medical supplies Iraqis most need. Can AID get this?].

In 199x,
~~When~~ Saddam finally and grudgingly accepted U.N. Security Council Resolution 986 -- proposed by the United States and permitting the sale of "oil-for-food" -- ^{Then,} he balked for a year before allowing it to take effect. To this day, he hinders its operation and deploys his people as "human shields" around suspected weapons sites -- while appealing to ~~the court of~~ international public opinion to lift the sanctions with images of starving Iraqi children and patients suffering from a lack of vital medicines. *91's the cruelest hoax of all*

Despite Saddam's cynical efforts to manipulate the plight of his people for political ends, we are determined to do all we can to make "oil-for-food" work better. We welcome the Secretary General's recommendation to increase the program ^{to} ~~from \$2B to \$5B~~. The more Iraqi oil goes to feeding Iraqis, the less Saddam can spend on arms. [TK: update at speech time.]

[need rhetorically to go back to premise; long time since #2

Third, we will strictly enforce the No Fly and No Drive Zones in southern and northern Iraq.

Already, our airforce controls the skies over Iraq, from the southern suburbs of Baghdad to the Kuwaiti border and over northern Iraq -- severely reducing the threat Iraq poses to the Gulf countries and Turkey. We have flown more sorties to enforce these "No Fly Zones" than in all of Desert Storm. And our forces in the Gulf are ready to respond to any Iraqi aggression quickly and decisively -- countering any threat in a matter of days instead of the months it took in 1990.

Fourth, we will closely monitor Iraq's activities with our own intelligence methods, including

stepped-up U-2 flights. ~~And we~~ will take immediate action if Iraq attempts to disrupt these efforts.

~~Fifth, we will act again if we have evidence that Iraq is trying to rebuild its weapons program~~

demonstrated certainty
That ~~very certain~~ will help deter Saddam from making the same mistake again. If he does, he will pay a very heavy price.

~~Finally, we will look for effective ways to support groups opposed to Saddam. Of course we~~

There is no question that Iraq, and the world, would be better off if S# were not in power. We have supported
~~would welcome a change in Iraq. [Bruce would cut these first two sentences and go directly to:]~~

opposition groups in the past and are prepared to
We are ready to work with any successor to Saddam who meets the fundamental requirement I mentioned earlier -- demonstrated peaceful intentions. More than that, we are ready to find ways

remain interested in effective ways to do so
~~to ease the burden of debt and compensation created by Saddam. Why should Iraqis pay for~~

in the future,
~~Saddam's wars forever? If a new government shows a real commitment to peace, my~~

~~government will do all it can to ease the burdens created by Saddam.~~

where?

⊕ P6

There are alternatives to our approach. I believe they are the wrong way to secure America's interests.

Some ~~say~~ ^{suggest} we should meet Saddam half way by agreeing to seal off so-called "Presidential" sites or to change the balance of the inspection teams. The result would be a Potemkin UNSCOM, unable to inspect the ~~very~~ sites ~~most~~ likely to harbor weapons of mass destruction... limited in its activities at many other sites ^o ~~with far fewer Americans and Britons, whose highly technical expertise UNSCOM needs to complete its mission.~~ Such a stunning reversal of the Resolutions imposed on and accepted by Iraq after the Gulf War would be unacceptable -- and pose a grave threat to our interests.

Others insist that ~~because Saddam is the problem, the only effective solution is to~~ remove him from power. ~~Certainly, the Iraqi people, the region and the world would be better off with a different regime. But the bottom line is this: we do not need to remove Saddam to meet our core objective -- containing his weapons of mass destruction capacity.~~

*U.S. forces to
for ~~us~~ to*

I believe
~~Just as important,~~ the costs and risks associated with such a venture would far outweigh the benefits ^{to our strategic interests.} It would require a massive ground invasion on the scale of Desert Storm -- hundreds of thousands of American troops -- and risk large losses of our soldiers and Iraqi civilians. ~~The~~

~~likelihood of success is low -- Saddam is very hard to pin down. And the unintended consequences of a major war could well endanger, not enhance, our interests. For example, by splitting Iraq in two, we would run the risk of destabilizing the region, threatening Turkey's interests in the North and giving Iran a large strategic opening. And we would inherit the future~~

But ~~that~~ There is a question that Iraq and the world would be better off if it were not in power. As Secretary Albright said in March, we would be prepared to work with a successor regime to bring Iraq into the family of nations. In the

meanwhile, we have worked with Iraqi opposition groups and will continue to do so.

of Iraq for years to come. Let the armchair generals have a field day in print or on t.v.:

invading Iraq would be a terrible mistake.

Contending with Saddam Hussein's Iraq through diplomacy ^{when possible and force when necessary} backed by force is the best way to ^{necessary}
 secure ^S America's fundamental interests. Inexorably, we will continue to tighten the box on ^W
 Saddam, whittling away at his weapons of mass destruction program, weakening his ability to
 attack his neighbors. Sustaining our policy will require constant vigilance. ^{Yes} It will cause
~~occasional~~ ^{some of} tension with our friends and allies ^{over tactics}. And it will demand the ^(discipline) patience to
 accept that there may be no near term endgame. But we are on the right course. If we stick to it,
 it offers the best prospects for compelling Saddam to meet his obligations to the international
 community [or sparking the emergence of a new Iraqi regime prepared to live at peace with its
 neighbors and resume its rightful place in the community of nations]

ch wj
BR

As long as S.H. is in power, we must be prepared to stand firm against his ~~the~~ dangerous adventures that threaten a region of ~~sub~~ great strategic importance to us. ~~As long as~~ When the international community weakens in the face of his threats, S.H. simply is emboldened. It is a timeless lesson against aggressors and tyrants.

(K)

2/16/98 7 p.m.

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS ON IRAQ TO PENTAGON PERSONNEL
THE PENTAGON AUDITORIUM
FEBRUARY 17, 1998**

[Acknowledgments:] Mr. Vice President; Secretary Cohen; General Shelton; members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; General Zinni; [others tbd.]; members of the United States Armed Forces:

I have just received a very good briefing from America's military leadership on the status of our forces in the Persian Gulf. Before I left the Pentagon, I wanted to talk to you -- the men and women of America's military. You, your friends and your colleagues are on the front lines of this crisis with Iraq. I want you and the American people to hear from me what's at stake for America in the Persian Gulf -- and what we are doing to protect the peace, security and freedom we all cherish.

First, I would ask you to take a step back and consider why meeting the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's Iraq is so important to our security in the new era we are entering. This is a time of tremendous promise for our nation in the world. The superpower confrontation has ended. On every continent, democracy is securing for more and more people the basic freedoms we Americans take for granted. Bit by bit, the Information Age is chipping away at the barriers -- economic, political and social -- that once kept people locked in and freedom and prosperity locked out.

But for all its promise, our time is not free from peril -- especially as a result of the reckless acts of outlaw states and an unholy axis of terrorists, international criminals and drug traffickers.

These 21st century predators feed on the free flow of information and technology... and the free movement of people and ideas. They will be all the more lethal if we allow weapons of mass destruction to fall into their hands.

There is no more immediate or more lethal example of this threat than Saddam Hussein's Iraq. His regime endangers the safety of Iraq's people, the stability of the region, and the security of all of us. It poses a direct challenge to much we are working for -- to promote a just and lasting peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors... to protect the free flow of vital resources... to preserve the stability and security of our friends in the region... to prevent terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction... to help all the people of the region enjoy the blessings of prosperity and hope.

I want everyone to understand how this current crisis came about. As a condition for the Gulf War cease-fire, the United Nations demanded -- and Saddam Hussein agreed -- to declare in 15 days his nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. The U.N. set up a special commission of highly trained international experts, called UNSCOM, to make sure Iraq made good on that commitment.

We had very good reason to insist that Iraq disarm. Saddam has built up a terrible arsenal -- and he has used it. Not once, but many times in a decade-long war with Iran. Against combatants --

and against civilians. Against a foreign adversary -- and against his own people. And during the Gulf War, Saddam launched Scuds against Saudi Arabia, Israel and Bahrain.

Instead of playing by the rules, Saddam has spent the better part of the past decade trying to cheat his solemn commitment to the international community. Consider just some of the facts:

- Iraq repeatedly made false declarations about what weapons it had left. When UNSCOM uncovered evidence that gave lie to those declarations, Iraq simply amended the reports. For example, Iraq revised its nuclear declaration four times within 14 months and has submitted six different biological warfare declarations -- each of which UNSCOM has rejected.

- In 1995, Hussein Kamel -- Saddam's son-in-law and the chief organizer of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program -- defected to Jordan. He revealed that Iraq was continuing to conceal weapons and missiles and the capacity to build many more, including an offensive biological warfare capability -- all of which Iraq had previously and vehemently denied.

a 5# bag of anthrax, if properly dispersed, could kill half the population of Washington, DC. (Could also cause a line about how much Saddam has)

- Throughout, Iraqi agents have undermined and undercut UNSCOM -- harassing the inspectors, lying to them, disabling monitoring cameras, literally spiriting evidence out the back door of suspect facilities as inspectors walked through the front door.

Despite Iraq's deceptions, UNSCOM has done a remarkable job. Its inspectors have uncovered and destroyed more weapons of mass destruction capacity than was destroyed during the entire Gulf War. Over the last few months, as they have come closer and closer to rooting out Iraq's

DDP

remaining weapons capacity, Saddam has undertaken yet another gambit to thwart their mission. By imposing debilitating conditions on the inspectors and declaring key sites off-limits, including some that could be literally city-sized, he is trying to create a safe haven for his remaining weapons, the missiles to deliver them -- and most importantly, the capacity to build more.

We are working very hard to find a peaceful and principled solution to this crisis of Saddam's making. That would be the best outcome for our interests. The UNSCOM system works -- that's why Saddam is so desperate to end it. On my instructions, Secretary Cohen, Secretary Albright and Ambassador Richardson have traveled literally around the world to work with our friends and allies. I have been in constant contact with my counterparts. We all agree that there is a very simple solution: Saddam must allow the UN weapons inspectors free, full, and unfettered inspection of all suspect sites. Period. That is what he committed to do after the Gulf War. That is what we must hold him to now. If there is a way to convince Saddam that he must reverse course, we will pursue it to the very end.

But if Saddam won't act, we must be prepared to do so. Think for a moment of the consequences if Saddam fails to comply and we fail to act. He will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will rebuild a devastating arsenal of destruction. And some day, some way, I guarantee you that he will use it. We cannot allow that to happen.

As you know, we have spent the past several weeks building up our forces in the Gulf -- and building a coalition of like-minded nations. Our force posture in the region would not be

possible without the support of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, the GCC states and Turkey. I thank them for their invaluable assistance. And many other friends and allies have agreed to provide forces, bases or logistical support -- including the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Argentina, Iceland, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. That list is growing.

If we have to use force, our purpose is clear: to seriously diminish the threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and its capacity to threaten its neighbors. I am very confident, from the briefing I have just received from America's military leaders, that we can achieve that objective and secure our vital strategic interests.

Let me be clear: a military operation is unlikely to destroy all of his weapons of mass destruction capacity. But it will leave him significantly worse off than he is now, in terms of his ability to threaten the world with these weapons or attack his neighbors. And he will know that the international community continues to have the will to act when he threatens.

Following any strike, we will carefully monitor Iraq's activities with all the means at our disposal. If Saddam seeks to rebuild his weapons of mass destruction capacity, we will be prepared to strike him again. The economic sanctions will remain in place until Saddam allows UNSCOM to complete its mission. Already they've denied him and his military \$110 billion. And we will continue to enforce the No Fly Zone from the southern suburbs of Baghdad to the Kuwaiti border and in Northern Iraq -- making it much more difficult for Iraq to walkover Kuwait again or threaten Turkey.

complies fully with all UN Resolutions

CS

The Kurds in Northern Iraq.

a threat to Turkey would be humanitarian i.e. many refugees

2/11

5/5
6
troops
or service
members

5/5
1
X

Let me say to all of you here, sending our ~~soldiers~~ into harm's way is the weightiest decision any President has to make. But while force can never be the first answer, it sometimes becomes the only answer. You are the best prepared, best equipped, best trained fighting force in the world. I know that, should force prove necessary, your commanders will do everything they can to protect your safety. But no military action is risk free. I know you are ready. The American people must be, too.

Dealing with Saddam Hussein demands constant vigilance. And sometimes it demands action. Since the Gulf War, we have pushed Saddam back every time he posed a new threat. When Baghdad plotted to assassinate former President Bush, we struck hard at Iraq's intelligence headquarters. When Saddam threatened another invasion by massing his troops at the Kuwaiti border in 1994, we immediately deployed our troops, ships and planes to the region -- and Saddam backed down. When Saddam forcefully occupied Irbil in Northern Iraq, we broadened our control over Iraq's skies by extending the No Fly Zone.

Let there be no doubt: we are prepared to act. But Saddam Hussein can end this crisis tomorrow by letting the weapons inspectors complete their mission. He made a solemn commitment to the international community to give up his weapons of mass destruction. One way or the other, we are determined that he make good on it.

Saddam Hussein's Iraq reminds us of what we learned in the 20th century - and warns us of what we must know in the 21st. In this century, we found out through harsh experience that the only

answer to aggression and outlaw behavior is firmness, determination and, if necessary, action.

In the next century, the community of nations will see more and more of the very threat Iraq poses -- a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction. If we fail to respond, Saddam and all those who would follow in his footsteps will be emboldened by the knowledge that they can act with impunity. But if we act as one, we can safeguard our immediate interests -- and send a clear message to every would-be tyrant and terrorist that the international community has the wisdom, the will and the way to protect peace and security in a new era.

Blinken, Antony J.

From: Baker, James E.
Sent: Friday, November 13, 1998 8:16 AM
To: Blinken, Antony J.
Cc: Riedel, Bruce O.; Leavy, David C.; Todd, Gwennyth E.; Marty, Joseph H.
Subject: FW: Draft POTUS Speech on Iraq ~~[SECRET]~~

Importance: High

Good job. Thank you for look.

A couple of edits, which I have put in the text below.

1. p. 3, don't say Coke, say soda.
2. p. 6, I would tie all our objectives to the overriding goal of compliance with UN requirements on WMD. That is where we get our international (and much of our domestic) legal authority to strike and strike hard.
3. p. 8, If we are going to hit palaces, they must be more than the lavish homes of cronies. Of course, they are. Command and control, SRG, weapons. I have suggested text. I rate this edit as very important.
4. p. 8, and 9. Two international lawyers preferences. Not essential, but if the language works just as well, I would use it.
5. I do not know full scope of 8 Arab nation statement yesterday, but may be useful to cite to in making the point that Iraq stands alone against the world community.

-----Original Message-----

From: Blinken, Antony J.
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 1998 11:33 PM
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor; Riedel, Bruce O.; Marty, Joseph H.; Leavy, David C.; Baker, James E.
Subject: Draft POTUS Speech on Iraq ~~[SECRET]~~
Importance: High



ovalofficeiraq.doc

For SRB/JS:

1. Bruce has not yet seen
2. Still working on ending. Will try to hit the mark first thing in a.m.
3. It runs between 15 and 17 minutes.

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526
2013-0770-M (1.19)
02/27/2020 KDC

11/12/98 11:30 p.m.

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON IRAQ
THE WHITE HOUSE
DATE TBD.**

Earlier today, I ordered our armed forces to strike Iraq. Their target is a regime that has repeatedly demonstrated contempt for the well-being of its people, the peace of its region, and the security of the world. Their mission is to seriously diminish the threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and to reduce Iraq's capacity to threaten its neighbors. Their mandate is to protect the national interest of the United States -- and indeed, the interest of freedom-loving people everywhere.

I want to speak with you about why we have decided to use force in Iraq and what we hope to accomplish. To that end, I would ask you first to think back to the beginning of this decade -- and the end of the Gulf War.

As a condition for the cease-fire, the United Nations demanded and Iraq agreed to declare and destroy all of its chemical, biological and nuclear weapons capability and the missiles to deliver them. The international community had very good reason to insist that Saddam disarm. Other countries have weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. With Saddam, there is one big difference: he has used them. Not once, but repeatedly -- unleashing chemical weapons against Iranian troops during a decade-long war of attrition. Not only against soldiers, but against civilians -- firing SCUD missiles at the citizens of Tel Aviv, Riyadh and Manama. Not only against a foreign enemy, but against his own people -- gassing Kurdish civilians in northern

Iraq. The international community had little doubt that, left unchecked, Saddam would use these terrible weapons again.

To ensure that Iraq made good on its commitment to disarm, the United Nations kept in place tough economic sanctions -- while exempting food, medicine and other humanitarian supplies to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people. The U.N. also established a highly professional group of weapons inspectors from dozens of countries -- called UNSCOM -- to oversee the destruction of Iraq's arsenal of weapons and missiles and to verify that Iraq did not attempt to rebuild that arsenal. Iraq was given fifteen days to disclose its weapons of mass destruction capability and to prepare for their destruction.

Iraq could have put itself on the path to ending sanctions and its isolation long ago by simply meeting its obligations. Instead, for the better part of decade, Iraq has played a deadly game of cheat and retreat -- withholding vital information from the inspectors, misleading and harassing them, blocking their access to suspect sites, destroying evidence in plain view -- all in an effort to retain its weapons of mass destruction.

Let me give you a few examples of Iraq's flagrant failure to comply with its obligations.

- Iraq has repeatedly and consistently made false declarations about the weapons and missiles it retained after the Gulf War. When UNSCOM confronted Iraq with contradictory evidence, Iraq simply withdrew and revised its reports. For example, Iraq revised its nuclear declarations four times within 14 months and submitted six different biological warfare

reports -- all of which were rejected by UNSCOM and the International Atomic Energy Agency as incomplete and inaccurate.

- In 1995, following the defection of the head of its weapons program to Jordan, Iraq admitted what it had denied for four years: that it had developed an offensive biological warfare capability, including half a million liters [TK: = ? gallons] of biological agents such as anthrax, botulinum and ricin. [TK: can/should we say enough to fill X cans of SodaCoke?]
- When Iraq disclosed its biological weapons program, it was forced to destroy the Al Hakam factory -- the largest biological weapons production facility in the world -- which it had insisted was a legitimate [TK: what products] plant.
- For nearly five years, Iraq denied that it had produced or weaponized VX -- the most advanced, deadly and long-lasting chemical weapon in the world. Evidence to the contrary forced Iraq to reveal the existence of a VX program. Just last month [TK] a panel of international experts confirmed the findings of an American laboratory that VX was present on the remnants of Iraqi missile warheads.

Despite nearly a decade of defiance, the weapons inspectors have done a remarkable job.

Through dogged determination and tremendous skill, they have found and destroyed more of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and missile capability than was destroyed during the Gulf War. This includes nearly 40,000 chemical weapons, more than 100,000 gallons of chemical

weapons agents, 48 operational missiles and 30 warheads specially fitted for chemical and biological weapons. [TK: update? These numbers from February]

But UNSCOM's mission is not yet complete. Stockpiles of chemical and biological munitions and a small number of missiles remain unaccounted for. Most importantly, Iraq still has the capacity to rebuild its production program for chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. As UNSCOM has come closer and closer to ferreting out Iraq's remaining weapons capacity, Saddam has become increasingly brazen in his efforts to break the inspection system.

First, last Fall, Iraq demanded that UNSCOM remove all American inspectors from its teams. Then, in January, it denied UNSCOM free and full access to all suspect sites, including Presidential palaces the size of a city. Both times, we built tremendous diplomatic pressure on Iraq, backed by overwhelming force. Both times, Baghdad reversed course. In March, Saddam pledged to U.N. Secretary General Koffi Annan that he would re-open all of Iraq to the weapons inspectors, with no more road blocks or run-arounds.

Then, in August -- for the third time in a year -- Iraq again stopped cooperating with the inspectors and demanded that the U.N. lift economic sanctions. Even though the United Nations had warned Iraq of the "severest consequences" if it breached the agreement with Secretary General Annan, we sought to compel compliance by peaceful means. Working with the other members of the U.N. Security Council, we secured a unanimous resolution condemning Iraq's actions and demanding that it immediately resume full cooperation with the weapons inspectors.

Then, along with all the members of the Security Council, we supported what Iraq has said it wants: a comprehensive review of Iraq's compliance record, provided Saddam allows UNSCOM back on the job.

If all Saddam sought was sanctions relief, he could have begun to achieve that by taking the Security Council's offer -- indeed, he could have achieved that long ago by meeting his obligations to the international community. Instead, within twelve hours of the Security Council's offer, Iraq shut down UNSCOM's operations completely. Then, Saddam rejected all appeals from Secretary General Annan, from his Arab neighbors, from nations throughout the region and around the world.

This latest twist in a consistent course of defiance confirms that Saddam's real goal is to have it both ways -- to get rid of the sanctions without getting rid of his weapons of mass destruction. Saddam's two-decade track record of terror, aggression and deceit makes clear that he fully intends to develop, deploy and, we must assume, use weapons of mass destruction, if given the chance.

That is a risk we cannot accept -- and we are determined to minimize. We did everything we could for as long as we could to convince Saddam to reverse course peacefully and permit the inspectors to get back to work. That remains the most effective way to uncover, destroy and prevent Iraq from rebuilding its weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them. But Saddam's refusal to let the inspectors visit any and all suspect sites and to monitor compliance at known production facilities effectively ended the inspection system.

That creates a clear and present danger to the stability of the Persian Gulf and the security of people everywhere. Without inspections and on-site monitoring, Iraq is free to begin rebuilding an arsenal of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them -- in a matter of months, not years. At the same time, a failure to respond would embolden Saddam to take advantage of that opening -- sending him the message that he can, with impunity, rearm and threaten the peace of his region. Simply put, Saddam would conclude that the international community had lost its will. He would rebuild his arsenal of horrific weapons. And he would use them.

That is why earlier today, on the unanimous recommendation of my national security team, and with the support of [TK: describe international support?] I ordered our armed forces to act.

[TK: Describe campaign?]

As I said at the outset, the purpose of this campaign is to degrade substantially Iraq's ability to develop and deliver weapons of mass destruction, and so reduce the threat Iraq poses to the region and to the world. The campaign will diminish Iraq's capacity to threaten its neighbors with conventional force. And it will weaken Saddam's command and control over his military and his people. All of which will lead to Iraq's compliance with the United Nation's demands.

[Tony: Not essential, but ties our objectives to the UN's legal authority. Good for lawyers.

May head off charges that we are going beyond the UN's goals and carrying out a US vendetta.]

Let me be clear about what we can and cannot achieve. We cannot destroy all of the chemical and biological munitions or ingredients Iraq has hidden away. Nor can we destroy entirely its capacity to develop new munitions. But by eliminating known production facilities, we can seriously set back any effort to rebuild Iraq's arsenal. And we can significantly reduce its ability to deliver the weapons it still has or could produce by destroying the facilities used to make missiles and maintaining a strict No Fly Zone to keep Iraq's airplanes out of the skies.

I very much hope that Saddam will take into account what his actions have wrought and come back into cooperation with UNSCOM. But we have to expect that he will not -- and we are prepared to deal with Saddam if, as is likely, he continues to defy and deceive.

First, when the strikes end, we will carefully monitor Iraq's activities with all the means at our disposal. Manufacturing weapons on a militarily significant scale is a substantial undertaking. So is building delivery systems, which would require rebuilding factories, manufacturing missiles and testing them. Each of these activities is relatively easy to detect. If Iraq pursues them, we will strike again -- whenever, wherever and for however long it is necessary.

Second, we will continue to contain Iraq's conventional military threat to the region by maintaining a No Fly Zone from the southern suburbs of Baghdad to the Kuwaiti border... and keeping substantial power in place to respond firmly to acts of aggression. If Saddam seeks to lash out at his neighbors, we will stop him.

Third, we will sustain what have been among the most extensive sanctions in history. Sanctions hurt the Iraqi regime. The proof can be found in Saddam's desperate attempts to lift them. To date, sanctions have cost Saddam more than \$120 billion -- resources that could and almost certainly would have been used to rebuild his military or develop weapons of mass destruction.

Let me make clear again that sanctions are aimed at the Iraqi regime, not the Iraqi people. From the start, we exempted food and medicine. We took the lead in proposing that Iraq be allowed to sell limited amounts of its oil and use the proceeds to pay for humanitarian supplies, subject to U.N. monitoring. Saddam rejected that offer for five years -- in effect taking the needs of his own people hostage -- while spending what resources he had building lavish palaces for himself, ~~and his cronies, and his weapons programs.~~ [Tony: Earlier we tie Palaces to the weapons program, if palaces are hit, we will do so because they are military targets, i.e., command and control, SRG, or weapons hubs, not because they are homes for cronies. Therefore, we need to continue the tie to weapons.]

Finally, in 1996, Saddam relented and allowed the oil-for-food program to take effect. Since then, the UN has approved 97 percent of the contracts for humanitarian supplies, delivered some [TK] million tons of food to the Iraqi people, and helped increase the average caloric intake to 2000 calories a day, well-above the 1250 calories per day average before oil-for-food took effect. Even so, Saddam continues to hinder the program and reject foreign donations of food and medicine while deploying his people as "human shields" around suspected weapons sites. And all the while, he appeals to international public opinion with images purporting to show starving Iraqi children. This is the mother of cruel deceptions.

Fourth, we will strengthen our support for Iraq's democratic opposition and work to hasten the day of deliverance for the Iraqi people. They deserve leaders committed to peace and democracy -- and committed to them. We look forward to an Iraqi government that respects the human rights of its people and abides by international law. The Iraq Liberation Act passed by Congress and which I recently signed adds greater resources to this long term effort.

My fellow Americans, throughout Saddam's decade of defiance, only our steadfast determination -- in strongly supporting the effort to disarm Iraq, maintaining sanctions, enforcing a No Fly Zone and responding firmly to Iraqi provocations -- has stopped Iraq from rebuilding its weapons of mass destruction or seriously threatening its neighbors. The months ahead will require more of our determination, our strength and our resolve.

We must be equal to the challenge. In the century we are leaving, America has often made the difference between tyranny and freedom... chaos and community... war and peace. Now, in a new century, we have a remarkable opportunity to shape a future more peaceful, prosperous and secure than the past -- but only if we stand strong against those who would undermine peace and progress. Saddam Hussein's Iraq is a threat to peace [international peace and security is the UN buzz term – your choice] and a rebuke to progress. And it is a test case for the very kind of problem we will see more and more of in the 21st century -- a rogue regime armed with weapons of mass destruction and prepared to use them. [Need ending]

[Much as we wish it were so, the problem posed by Saddam Hussein's Iraq will not go away overnight. But much as Saddam must wish it were so, neither will the United States, our friends and allies around the world, and the interests and ideals we represent. And we will still be here when a new day finally dawns for Iraq and its people.]

[Need to work ending tying back to threat of WMD]

11/13/98 4 p.m.

Blinken

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON IRAQ
THE WHITE HOUSE
DATE TBD.**

For eight years, since the end of the Persian Gulf War, Saddam Hussein has refused to account to the world for his weapons of mass destruction. Now, he has shut down the international inspection system established by the United Nations to ensure his compliance. If we allow Saddam to proceed with impunity, he will rebuild his weapons of mass destruction . And just as he has before, he will use them -- endangering one of the most vital regions of the world. If we do not act decisively now, there is no doubt in my mind that in the not too distant future -- in a year or two or three -- Americans will again be called upon to fight the Persian Gulf war. We cannot permit that to happen.

That is why, earlier today, I ordered our armed forces to strike Iraq. They were joined by British forces, with the support of many of our friends and allies. Their mission is to attack Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program and its capacity to threaten its neighbors. Their mandate is to protect the national interest of the United States -- and indeed, the interests of people throughout the region and around the world.

I want to speak with you about why we have decided to use force in Iraq and what we hope to accomplish. To that end, I would ask you first to think back to the beginning of this decade -- and the end of the Gulf War.

As a condition for the cease-fire, the United Nations demanded and Iraq agreed to declare and destroy all of its chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them. The international community had very good reason to insist that Saddam Hussein disarm. Other countries have weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. With Saddam, there is one big difference: he has used them. Not once, but repeatedly -- unleashing chemical weapons against Iranian troops during a decade-long war of attrition. Not only against soldiers, but against civilians -- firing SCUD missiles at the citizens of Tel Aviv, Riyadh and Manama. Not only against a foreign enemy, but against his own people -- gassing Kurdish civilians in northern Iraq. The international community had little doubt then -- and I have no doubt today -- that, left unchecked, Saddam Hussein will use these terrible weapons again.

To ensure that Iraq made good on its commitment to disarm, the United Nations kept in place tough economic sanctions -- exempting food, medicine and other humanitarian supplies, and later allowing Iraq to sell oil to buy more than 7 million tons of food for its people. In 1991, the U.N. also established a highly professional group of weapons inspectors from dozens of countries -- called UNSCOM -- to oversee the destruction of Iraq's arsenal and to verify that Iraq did not attempt to rebuild it. Back then, Iraq agreed to disclose its weapons of mass destruction capability and to prepare for its destruction within 15 days.

Iraq could have put itself on the path to ending sanctions and its isolation long ago simply by meeting its obligations. Instead, Iraq has played a deadly game of cheat and retreat -- withholding vital information from the inspectors, harassing them, blocking access to suspect sites, destroying evidence in plain view. Throughout this decade of defiance, Saddam has had one central purpose: to retain and rebuild his weapons of mass destruction.

Saddam Hussein says he has complied with his obligation to destroy his arsenal. But no one outside of Baghdad remotely believes that. Let me give you a few examples of Iraq's flagrant failure to comply with its obligations.

- In 1995, following the defection of the head of its weapons program, Iraq admitted what it had denied for four years: that it had developed an offensive biological warfare capability, including half a million liters [TK: = ? gallons] of biological agents such as anthrax, botulinum and ricin. That is enough to fill nearly 1.5 million soda cans. Iraq also was forced to reveal that a huge factory that it said was making livestock feed and pesticides was in fact producing biological weapons. That factory has been destroyed.
- For nearly five years, Iraq denied that it had produced or weaponized VX -- the most advanced, deadly and long-lasting chemical weapon in the world. Evidence to the contrary forced Iraq to reveal the existence of a VX program. A panel of international experts confirmed the findings of an American laboratory that VX was present on the remnants of Iraqi missile warheads.
- Just this summer, an Iraqi air force document discovered by the inspectors shows that after the war, Iraq retained far more chemical munitions than it had led UNSCOM to believe.

Despite the run-arounds and road blocks, the weapons inspectors have done a remarkable job. Through dogged determination and tremendous skill, they found and destroyed more of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and missile capability than was destroyed during the Gulf War.

This includes nearly 40,000 chemical weapons, more than 690 tons of chemical weapons agents, 48 operational missiles and 30 warheads specially fitted for chemical and biological weapons.

UNSCOM has said
 But UNSCOM's mission is not yet complete. Stockpiles of chemical and biological munitions and a small number of missiles remain unaccounted for. Iraq still has the capacity to rebuild its production program for chemical and biological weapons and, perhaps most importantly, the missiles to deliver them. As UNSCOM has closed in on Iraq's remaining weapons capacity, Saddam's intentions have become all the more clear: to break the inspection system. ✓

This crisis did not come upon us suddenly, nor have we acted precipitously. Twice before in the past year, Saddam tried to cripple the inspectors. Both times, at considerable cost and effort, we built tremendous diplomatic pressure on Iraq, backed by overwhelming force. Both times, at the 11th hour, Baghdad reversed course.

This time, in August, Iraq suspended cooperation with the inspectors and placed before the international community a remarkable demand: ^{written} despite all of the evidence to the contrary, declare Iraq in compliance with its obligations and lift economic sanctions. Get rid of the sanctions, but let Iraq keep its weapons of mass destruction capability. That is an offer that no one in the world ^{could} ~~can~~ accept. And no one has. The United Nations Security Council voted 15 to zero to condemn Saddam's actions and demand that he immediately come into compliance. This week, eight Arab nations -- Egypt, Syria and the six Persian Gulf States -- warned Saddam that Iraq alone would bare the blame for the consequences of defying the United Nations.

Since August, we have sought a peaceful and principled solution. Accomplishing our goals peacefully is always preferable, and the threshold for using military force should be high. But Saddam has not reversed course. And his decision to end the inspection system creates a clear and present danger to the stability of the Persian Gulf and the security of people everywhere. That danger cannot go unanswered.

Without inspections and on-site monitoring, Iraq is free to begin rebuilding an arsenal of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them -- in a matter of months, not years. At the same time, if Iraq can unilaterally terminate inspections with impunity, and we do not respond, the message to Saddam will be clear: The international community has given you a green light. Our threats of force are hollow and meaningless. ~~He~~ Saddam will conclude that the world has lost its will. He will rebuild an arsenal of weapons. And he will use them.

As you can understand, I will not go into the specifics of our strike until it is over. But let me say that this campaign has a clear purpose and is part of a long term strategy. By attacking Saddam's weapons of mass destruction program and his military infrastructure, we will deliver a powerful response to his decision to end the inspections and make it more difficult for him to threaten his neighbors.

I very much hope that Saddam will realize what his actions have wrought and come back into cooperation with UNSCOM. But we have to be prepared that he will not -- and we must deal with the very real danger he poses. What is our long term strategy?

First, we must be ready to use force again if Saddam attempts to rebuild his weapons of mass destruction or their delivery systems, threatens his neighbors, or once again attacks his own Kurdish citizens. We will step up our intelligence gathering and maintain the No Fly Zone from the southern suburbs of Baghdad to the Kuwaiti border to alert us to Iraq's activities. The credible threat of force – made more credible today – is the surest way to contain the danger that Saddam poses.

~~with a~~ *Wal with a int / Co*

Second, ~~we will~~ maintain and enforce what have been among the most extensive sanctions in history. Sanctions hurt the Iraqi regime. The proof can be found in Saddam's desperate attempts to lift them. To date, sanctions have cost Saddam more than \$120 billion -- resources that could and almost certainly would have been used to rebuild his military. The sanctions are aimed at the Iraqi regime, not the Iraqi people. We will continue to allow Iraq to sell oil and use the proceeds to pay for food, medicine and other humanitarian supplies.

But the hard fact is that so long as Saddam remains in power, he represents a potential threat to the well-being of his people, the peace of his region and the security of the world. Over the long term, the best way to end that threat once and for all is with a different government -- a government that is prepared to live in peace with its neighbors... a government that respects the rights of its people.

Let me be clear: bringing about change in Baghdad won't happen over night. It will take time and effort, but we will actively pursue that goal. We will strengthen our engagement with the full range of Iraqi opposition forces and work effectively and prudently with them to hasten the

day of deliverance for the Iraqi people. The Iraq Liberation Act passed by Congress, and which I recently signed, adds greater resources to this long term effort.

My fellow Americans, throughout this decade, only our steadfast determination -- in strongly supporting the effort to disarm Iraq, maintaining sanctions, enforcing a No Fly Zone and responding firmly to Iraqi provocations -- has contained the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. The weeks and months ahead will require more of our determination, our strength and our resolve.

The decision to use force today inexorably carries with it costs. Whenever American armed forces are placed in harm's way, we risk the loss of life. And while our strikes are focused on Iraq's military capabilities, there will be Iraqi casualties. Indeed, Saddam has not hesitated to victimize his own people in order to divert the world's attention. We must be prepared for these realities. Moreover, Saddam should have absolutely no doubt: if he retaliates against his neighbors, we will respond powerfully.

But these costs, heavy as they are, must be weighed against the price to the American people and to the world of inaction. If Saddam defies the world and we fail to respond... if he escapes from inspections and we turn our backs... we will face a far graver threat in the future. Saddam will lash out again at his neighbors. He will make war on his own people. Even worse, he will develop weapons of mass destruction. He will deploy them. And mark my words, he will use them. By acting today, it is less likely that we will face those dangers in the future.

We must be equal to this challenge. In the century we are leaving, America has often made the difference between tyranny and freedom... chaos and community... fear and hope. Now, in a new century, we have a remarkable opportunity to shape a future more peaceful and secure than the past -- but only if we stand strong against those who would destroy peace and threaten security. Today, as throughout this century, America is standing strong. Our course is clear. Our cause is right. Our resolve is unshakable. May God bless the brave men and women who are carrying out this vital mission. And may God bless America.

Blinken, Antony J.

From: Riedel, Bruce O.
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 1998 6:57 AM
To: Blinken, Antony J.; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Subject: RE: Iraq Speech -- As Delivered to POTUS for Review ~~[SECRET]~~

JIM/SRB--the language on responding to Iraqi lash out is tough but is not exactly the cheney language "absolutely overwhelming and devastating" do you want it to be consistent?

-----Original Message-----

From: Blinken, Antony J.
Sent: Friday, November 13, 1998 10:41 PM
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor; Riedel, Bruce O.
Subject: Iraq Speech -- As Delivered to POTUS for Review ~~[SECRET]~~

<< File: ovalofficeiraq3.doc >>

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526
2013-0770-M (1.24)
02/27/2020 KDE

SECRET

MEETING WITH
REPUBLIC OF KOREA PRESIDENT KIM DAE-JUNG

KEY OBJECTIVES

Stress the U.S. commitment to the U.S.-ROK security alliance and the key role it plays in preserving stability both on the Korean Peninsula and in East Asia.

Reaffirm support for Kim's economic reform efforts and stress the need for continued reforms, particularly the restructuring of business conglomerates.

Reaffirm support for Kim's engagement policy toward North Korea while emphasizing the urgency of resolving our concerns about North Korea's suspect site and missile programs.

Thank Kim for his efforts in support of democratization in the region and engage him on further cooperative steps, particularly in Burma.

Express U.S. support for Korea's engagement on global warming cooperation and urge that Korea agree to a binding emissions target.

CONTEXT OF MEETING

Your visit to Korea provides an opportunity to demonstrate the strength of our alliance as we face a potential confrontation with North Korea and to reassure Kim that we will continue to consult closely and take his views fully into account.

While we have engaged the DPRK in three separate sets of negotiations covering state-sponsored terrorism, missiles, and Four Party Talks (and are urgently seeking a fourth round of negotiations concerning the suspect facility), we have yet to make significant progress in any of these talks. In particular, the DPRK's failure to negotiate seriously about access to the suspicious underground site and to curtail its missile programs undermines the Agreed Framework and puts Congressional funding as well as Japanese funding at risk. The North's actions also have fueled the ROK's interest in longer-range missiles of its own, which raises nonproliferation and regional security concerns.

SECRET

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)
Declassify on: 10/22/08

DECLASSIFIED IN PART
PER E.O. 13526

2013-0770-M (1.25) 02/27/2020 KDE

SECRET

President Kim's embrace of the IMF program and demand for restructuring of banks and large businesses (chaebol) struck a chord within the Korean public. Although political consensus for reform is holding, the severity of the recession, labor actions, and resistance to reform by the chaebols will continue to slow the pace.

AGENDA

Security Alliance

Military Coordination. The U.S.-ROK alliance demonstrates its strength in regular bilateral consultations, including the annual Security Consultative Meeting (SCM) of defense ministers held November 3. To maintain readiness, the U.S.-ROK Combined Forces Command (CFC) carries out an extensive exercise program, including three major theater-wide exercises each year, field training, and computer simulation exercises. Our two defense establishments have in recent years undertaken a mid- and long-term security dialogue aimed at adapting the alliance once the DPRK threat is removed. President Kim has publicly stated that U.S. forces should remain in the ROK following Korean unification.

Defense Readiness. The economic crunch in South Korea has prompted budgetary belt-tightening across the board, including the first cut in Korea's defense budget since the Korean War. President Kim and senior ROK defense officials have reaffirmed their commitment to a continued strong defense posture, but it will be important to ensure that defense cuts do not undermine deterrence or diminish readiness.

EO 13526.1.4d

SECRET

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)
Declassify on: 10/22/08

SECRET

EO 13526 1.4d

North Korea

You should brief President Kim on the status of the various negotiations and reassure him you are sensitive to his concerns about the threat of a North Korean confrontation to the military and financial security of South Korea. At the same time, you need his acknowledgement that the viability of the KEDO agreement can not be preserved without a resolution of the suspect site and at least some progress on missiles.

Agreed Framework/North Korea Policy Coordinator. North Korea's recent actions -- including incursions into South Korea, suspect underground construction, and the August 31 missile launch over Japan -- undermined support for the Agreed Framework both in Japan and in our Congress. In FY99, Congress provided \$35 million to KEDO for heavy fuel oil to be provided in tranches of \$15 million and \$20 million. These are subject to certifications related to progress in peace talks, spent fuel canning, DPRK nuclear and missile activities, satisfaction of U.S. concerns about suspect underground construction, and the appointment of a "North Korea Policy Coordinator." The North Korea Policy Coordinator will undertake a full assessment of the implications of recent developments (the discovery of the suspect site, the missile test) for our current policy. The Coordinator will consult closely with the ROK, as well as Japan and China, as he undertakes this project.

Four Party Peace Process. Our goal in the October 21-23 round was to create momentum by establishing working groups on tension reduction and Armistice replacement. [DPRK agreement to this was a significant step forward in the process.] We remain prepared to use possible sanctions-easing steps as our principal bargaining leverage in the subsequent rounds if the North is prepared to address some of our concerns.

Missiles. During the third round of U.S.-DPRK missile talks October 1-2, the U.S. made clear that, in light of the August 31 DPRK missile launch, further No Dong/Taepo Dong missile launches or exports would have serious negative consequences for U.S.-DPRK relations. There was little substantial progress but the participants agreed to a fourth round as soon as is practical. We maintained our 1997 offer of limited sanctions easing in return for a freeze on

SECRET

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)
Declassify on: 10/22/08

SECRET

indigenous missile production, flight-testing, deployment, and exports. The DPRK rejected constraints on its indigenous missile activities, and claimed that sanctions easing would not provide sufficient income to compensate for lost missile export earnings. The DPRK asked for one billion dollars in compensation each year for several years until income from eased sanctions equaled its alleged loss of missile export earnings. Our estimate is that North Korea only earned \$50 million last year from its missile exports.

EO 13526, 1.4c, 1.4(d)

Suspect Underground Facility. The DPRK has claimed that the construction is a civilian facility. We will require access and will establish the principle in our discussions about suspect construction that we are not limited to a single visit at a single site. More importantly, unless the North can persuade us that the suspect site is not a nuclear facility, they will have to agree to shut it down with verification procedures. Compensation for on-site inspection visits, a point raised repeatedly by the DPRK, is out of the question, as are other incentives such as sanctions relief.

DPRK Food Situation. The food crisis will continue to be severe in the medium-term. The DPRK's agricultural problems are structural. Absent needed reforms, Pyongyang depends on outside aid to avert famine. In September, the U.S. announced it would give 300,000 metric tons of wheat in response to the 1998 World Food Program (WFP) appeal, following the 200,000 metric ton U.S. contribution in January, which has been delivered. South Korea was the only other major contributor to the WFP appeal, shipping 50,000 metric tons. But China remains the largest donor of food, most of which it provides outside of the WFP channel. Bilateral grants this year from China, the E.U., and the South Korean Red Cross reportedly totaled 236,000 metric tons of food and 50,000 metric tons of fertilizer. The DPRK repeatedly seeks to link food aid to progress in other areas. We avoid such linkages -- instead stressing that food assistance is humanitarian in nature and is dependent on an adequate monitoring regime.

SECRET

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)

Declassify on: 10/22/08

SECRET

Economic Crisis

Reforms and Prospects for Recovery. President Kim has demonstrated steadfast commitment to Korea's economic reform program and retains widespread popular support for its implementation.

Due to President Kim's and the international community's actions to address the crisis, financial markets in Korea have stabilized and recovered somewhat from last winter's lows. Reserves are now up to \$43 billion and interest rates are below pre-crisis levels. As a result of the crisis and the resulting shake-out, however, the real economy is in severe recession. Unemployment has tripled over the past twelve months, while real GDP will fall by as much as 7-9% this year. Export growth has been negative, while real incomes and domestic demand have fallen sharply. President Kim has called the decline "the most serious threat to Korea since the Korean War."

Korea has made great progress in its reform program, particularly in the areas of capital account liberalization and financial sector restructuring. Badly-needed labor market flexibility has been enhanced through the government's astute management of labor disputes, resulting in union acquiescence to some layoffs. The most difficult restructuring in the corporate sector is still ahead, however, and large Korean conglomerates are resisting reform.

U.S. Investment. The ROKG has stressed the need to attract foreign investment to help foot the bill for economic restructuring and improve the competitiveness of Korean industry. The USG has assisted Korea in its efforts to attract U.S. investment, initiating negotiations for a Bilateral Investment Treaty, and reopening OPIC programs in Korea. A Department of Commerce delegation will also visit the ROK early next year. A number of U.S. firms have shown interest in investing, but only a few deals have closed. Among these are Motorola's purchase of a majority stake in a small telecom company and Dow Chemical's partnership in a chemical plant. Investors cite problems over management control, pricing and lack of transparency as major impediments to investing in the ROK.

Trade Issues. The U.S. ran a trade surplus with Korea over the past three years, but will run a significant deficit this year, primarily due to a drop in U.S. exports to Korea. The ROKG has committed to trade liberalization as part of

SECRET

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)

Declassify on: 10/22/08

SECRET

its reform program, and has moved to address positively some outstanding trade issues, such as our recent agreement on autos. While Korea is moving forward on market access, U.S. industries' frustration with past ROKG industrial policy and current import surges are creating pressure in the U.S. to give Korea's compliance with its reform program special scrutiny and to limit Korean imports in certain sectors. This impulse is reflected in the insertion of a Korea-specific certification provision in the recent IMF funding legislation and in recent dumping and subsidies petitions filed against Korea by the U.S. steel industry.

Regional Issues

Support for Democracy in Asia. Kim has vocally supported democratic practices in Asia, and has focused on Burma in particular. (Kim has close links with Burmese opposition leader Aung San Suu Kyi.) The visit is an opportunity to build on your June meeting with Kim by underscoring our joint support for Asian democratization. We would particularly appreciate Korea's support at the U.N., perhaps by agreeing to co-sponsor the annual Burma resolution.

Climate Change

As an OECD member with both a high emissions level and a large per capita GDP, South Korea's participation is crucial to the success of climate change efforts. [Korea played a constructive role at COP-4, supporting our positions on flexibility mechanisms, including emissions trading, and making a positive statement of intent to adopt a binding emissions target in the future.] Korea continues, however, to resist the adoption of an early target, citing its current economic crisis and negative growth implications. This meeting presents an opportunity to reiterate that an emissions target can be conducive to growth and to urge Kim to adopt an early emissions target.

SECRET

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)
Declassify on: 10/22/08

~~SECRET~~

POINTS TO BE MADE FOR MEETING
WITH KOREAN PRESIDENT KIM DAE-JUNG

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526
2013-0770-M (1.27)
02/27/2020 KDE

Alliance

- Reaffirm that our joint deterrent posture is the foundation of mutual security - particularly in light of North Korea's unpredictability and uncertainties about the North's future.
- Note that our strong deterrence capability continues to facilitate our diplomatic efforts to engage the DPRK.
- Emphasize our commitment to reach a new defense cost-sharing agreement that addresses both countries concerns while preserving the readiness and deterrent capabilities of the alliance.

North Korea

- Reiterate our support for Kim's efforts to engage the DPRK. Although a slow process, Kim has the vision and long-term perspective required. The Agreed Framework and Four Party Talks complement Kim's engagement policy.
- Reassure Kim that the appointment of a North Korea Policy Coordinator does not signal a fundamental shift in our DPRK policy; the Coordinator will review the implications of recent developments for our North Korea Policy, including the suspect site and the missile test.
- Note that the Coordinator intends to consult closely with the ROK, as well as Japan and China, as he undertakes his review.
- Emphasize that we believe the Agreed Framework remains the best means for us to address our full range of concerns regarding North Korea.
- Underscore that although convening three plenary sessions of the Four Party Talks over 12 months is itself an achievement, progress toward our twin goals of tension reduction and replacement of the Armistice with a permanent peace arrangement remains the true measure of success.
- State that we will insist on site visits to resolve our concerns about the nature of suspect underground

~~SECRET~~

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)
Declassify on: 10/22/08

~~SECRET~~

construction in North Korea. Stress that we will establish the principle of future visits to any other sites that may be of concern.

- Assuming it is a nuclear related facility, insist that it be shutdown with procedures for verification.
- Emphasize the importance we attach to containing North Korea's program to develop, test, and export long-range missiles which are not only a threat to U.S. allies but which could stimulate proliferation.
- Assure Kim that we will coordinate very closely with the South on our negotiations with the North on the underground site, missiles, and other issues. We are fully aware of South Korean concerns about the risks of confrontation.
- Note the troubling food situation in North Korea. Aid continues to help, but we must guard against the onset of a humanitarian or security crisis. Together, we must be prepared to respond.
- Stress the need for full ROK transparency into its missile activities and the adoption of meaningful restraint in pursuing them. Press the ROK to meet our concerns soon in the U.S.-ROK Nonproliferation Task Force.

Economic Crisis

- Commend Kim on the progress Korea has made to date on its economic reform program. Financial stabilization has been achieved, and the difficult phase of restructuring is well underway.
- Underscore the positive effect that Kim's skillful handling of recent potential labor problems has had on the reform effort.
- Note our concern over the apparent reluctance of the corporate sector to restructure. Kim should do what he can to stimulate such restructuring without dictating outcomes.
- Reiterate U.S. intent to support Korea in its continued reform efforts.

~~SECRET~~

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)
Declassify on: 10/22/08

~~SECRET~~

- Stress recent U.S. efforts -- IMF funding and interest rate reductions -- and follow-through on June summit initiatives: OPIC programs reopened in ROK, initiation of Bilateral Investment Treaty negotiations, assistance with trade financing through large Exim and USDA export credit guarantee programs.
- Note that we are looking at other avenues of assistance, and ask Kim for his ideas in this regard.
- Assure Kim that the U.S. will keep its markets open to Korean imports. However, to stem protectionist pressure, Korea needs to move forward on trade liberalization. The recent resolution of the autos case was a plus for both sides. Our partners must open markets in the face of an increasing U.S. trade deficit.
- If raised: Your government's strong commitment to Korea's reform program will mitigate any practical effect of the Korea-specific certification provision in the recent IMF funding legislation. I am confident that the certification will give us an opportunity to reiterate our support for Korea's reform efforts.

Regional Issues

- Express appreciation for Kim's distinguished history of pro-democracy activities in Korea. Note Kim's high stature on democracy and human rights to foster democracy in Asia.
- Renew appeal for South Korea to join the U.S. in working for democracy in Burma, both by signing a multilateral statement of concern about recent developments and by supporting a strong resolution in the United Nations.

Climate Change

- Offer appreciation for the constructive role that Korea played at COP-4 in supporting U.S. on several issues.
- Note that Korea is an important player on this issue, and should adopt an early binding emissions target.
- Stress that such a commitment should not be construed as limiting Korea's growth potential because of the increased benefits of investment and financial resources that would result from emissions trading.

~~SECRET~~

Reasons: 1.5(b) and (d)
Declassify on: 10/22/08

12/15/98 2 am

PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
ADDRESS
THE WHITE HOUSE
DATE TBD.

- 1) shorten
- 2) short, direct, declarative sentences
- 3) barbershop talk, not high rhetoric

Earlier today, I ordered America's armed forces to strike military and security targets in Iraq.

Their mission is to attack Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs and its ^{military} capacity to threaten its neighbors. ^{Our purpose} Their ~~mandate~~ is to protect the national interests of the United States -- and, indeed, the interests of people throughout the region and around the world.

Tonight, I want to explain why we have decided to use force in Iraq, why we have acted now, and what we hope to accomplish.

Six weeks ago, Saddam Hussein announced that he would no longer cooperate with UNSCOM -- ^{called UNSCOM too} the highly professional United Nations weapons inspectors ^{who come from dozens of countries.} Their job it is to oversee the destruction of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability and ^{experts from} verify that Iraq does not attempt to rebuild it. The inspectors undertook this mission eight years ~~ago~~ ago, at the end of the Gulf War, when, as a condition for the cease-fire, ~~the United Nations demanded and~~ Iraq agreed to declare and destroy its arsenal.

The international community had ~~very~~ ^g good reason to set this requirement. Other countries possess weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. With Saddam, there is one big difference: he has used them. Not once, but repeatedly -- unleashing chemical weapons against Iranian troops during a decade-long war. Not only against soldiers, but against civilians -- firing SCUD missiles at the citizens of Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Iran. Not only against a

(57)

12/16/98 10 am

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON IRAQ
THE WHITE HOUSE
DATE TBD.**

Earlier today, I ordered America's armed forces to strike military and security targets in Iraq. Their mission is to attack Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs and its capacity to threaten its neighbors. Their mandate is to protect the national interests of the United States -- and, indeed, the interests of people throughout the region and around the world.

Tonight, I want to explain why we have decided to use force in Iraq, why we have acted now, and what we aim to accomplish.

Six weeks ago, Saddam Hussein announced that he would no longer cooperate with UNSCOM -- the highly professional United Nations weapons inspectors who come from dozens of countries. Their job it is to oversee the destruction of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability and to verify that Iraq does not attempt to rebuild it. The inspectors undertook this mission eight years ago, at the end of the Gulf War, when, as a condition for the cease-fire, the United Nations demanded and Iraq agreed to declare and destroy its arsenal.

The international community had very good reason to set this requirement. Other countries possess weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. With Saddam, there is one big difference: he has used them. Not once, but repeatedly -- unleashing chemical weapons against Iranian troops during a decade-long war. Not only against soldiers, but against civilians -- firing SCUD missiles at the citizens of Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Iran. Not only against a foreign enemy, but against his own people -- gassing Kurdish civilians in northern Iraq. The

international community had little doubt then – and I have no doubt today -- that, left unchecked, Saddam Hussein will use these terrible weapons again.

Faced with Saddam's latest act of defiance ^(in late October) we built intensive diplomatic pressure on Iraq, backed by overwhelming force. The UN Security Council voted 15 to zero to condemn Saddam's actions and demand that he immediately come into compliance. Eight Arab nations -- Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and five other Gulf states -- warned that Iraq alone would bear responsibility for the consequences of defying the UN.

is this detail necessary

When Saddam still failed to comply, the United States and Great Britain, with the support of friends and allies, prepared to ~~strike~~ ^(act militarily) it was only then, at the last possible moment ^(on November 14) that Iraq backed down, pledging to the world that it would, and I quote, "unconditionally resume

cooperation" with the weapons inspectors. I decided to call off the attack – with our airplanes ~~literally~~ ^{already} in the air – ~~because I concluded that we should test Saddam's willingness to cooperate.~~ ^{because he had given in to our demands and I concluded that our}

~~So that there would be no room for doubt,~~ ^{at the time} I made very clear what "unconditional cooperation" ~~meant,~~ ^{means,} based on existing UN resolutions and Iraq's own commitments. ~~Among other clear conditions, Iraq is required to resolve all outstanding issues raised by the weapons inspectors;~~ ^{And we} ~~honor all United Nations resolutions; give the inspectors unfettered, unconditional access to all suspect sites; and turn over all relevant documents.~~ ^{made it clear that if he failed to cooperate fully ~~we~~ would be prepared to act without further diplomacy or notice.}

support in the world would be stronger if we backed Saddam's willingness to cooperate

Over the past three weeks, the ^{UN} weapons inspectors have ~~tested~~ ^{carried out their plans for testing} Iraq's cooperation. The testing period ended this weekend and last night, UNSCOM's chairman, Richard Butler, reported the results to the UN Secretary General Annan. The conclusions are stark, sobering and profoundly

disturbing. ^{indeed, it} In four out of the five categories ^{has} tested, Iraq ~~not only~~ ^{set forth} has failed to cooperate, it actually has placed new restrictions on the inspectors. For example:

*documents?
archives?*

- When UNSCOM requested information on Iraq's weapons programs, Iraq refused, claiming that any further explanations should await a comprehensive review of its compliance by the UN. This flies directly in the face of a UN resolution providing that such a review will be considered only after Iraq resumes cooperation with the inspectors.

- Iraq ~~barred UNSCOM from inspecting a terrorist base in eastern Iraq.~~ It restricted UNSCOM's ability to photograph bombs related to its chemical weapons program. It tried to block an UNSCOM biological weapons team from videotaping a site and photocopying documents, and prevented it from asking questions of the Iraqis on site. Just prior to the inspection of another site, Iraq emptied out the building -- removing ^{not only} all documents, ^{but} furniture and equipment. It shut off access to the headquarters of its ruling party in Baghdad and says it will deny access to the party's other offices, even though UN resolutions make no exception for them, and even though UNSCOM has inspected them in the past.

add the strictly from Butler report, compare ch w/ BRUCE

- ~~Iraq has failed to turn over relevant documents. Of the twelve sets of documents UNSCOM has requested, Iraq has provided only one. Iraq has denied the existence of some documents~~ *But we know so at least some exist because [TK] has seen them* *before* and questioned UNSCOM's need for others. [TK: possible addition from CIA]

get language from CIA (attached)

failed its final test.

In sum, Iraq has ~~fallen far short of meeting the commitments it made.~~ As the UNSCOM report concludes, "[in spite of the opportunity presented by circumstances of the last month]... Iraq's conduct insured that no progress was able to be made in [the fields of disarmament] and accounting for Iraq's prohibited weapons programs... In light of this experience, it must ^{that is the absence of full cooperation} ~~regrettably~~ be recorded again that UNSCOM is not able to conduct the work mandated to it by

check first

by IRAC

the Security Council and thus to give the Council the assurances it requires with respect to Iraq's prohibited weapons programs." In short, UNSCOM can no longer do its job of finding Iraq's remaining weapons of mass destruction and preventing Iraq from rebuilding its arsenal. The UNSCOM inspectors left Iraq today. *Saddam's deception has defeated their effectiveness.*

| P 5 ✓

~~My fellow Americans, one decade of defiance is enough. For 14 months, this crisis over inspections has intensified. Until now, I have refrained from ordering military action against Iraq for two reasons. First, because accomplishing our goals peacefully is always preferable, and the threshold for using military force should be high. Second, because I was convinced that having the UN inspectors inside Iraq is the best way to disarm Iraq, provided they can operate without conditions or restrictions.~~

We have no choice but to act for several reasons: (A)

Despite road blocks and run-arounds, the inspectors have done a remarkable job. Their unrelenting pressure and professionalism compelled Iraq to repeatedly reverse itself and admit to weapons of mass destruction capability it had vehemently denied. For example, Iraq was forced to admit that it had developed offensive biological agents like anthrax... that a huge factory it said was making livestock feed and pesticides was in fact producing biological weapons... that it had produced VX, the most advanced chemical weapon in the world. Overall, UNSCOM helped force Iraq to disclose and destroy more weapons of mass destruction and missiles than were destroyed during the Gulf War. This includes nearly 40,000 chemical weapons, more than 690 tons of chemical weapons agents, a facility to make nuclear materials, a huge biological weapons complex, 48 operational missiles and 30 warheads specially fitted for chemical and biological weapons.

8

But UNSCOM's job is not yet done. According to the inspectors, Iraq has failed to account for stockpiles of chemical and biological munitions and a small number of missiles. It has been unable to explain the many gaps between what it claims to have destroyed and the evidence. And it still has the capacity to restart production for chemical and biological weapons and, just as importantly, for the missiles to deliver them. Now the inspectors are saying that even if they can stay in Iraq, their work will be a sham. Instead of the inspectors disarming Saddam, Saddam has disarmed the inspectors.

P 4

~~think~~ ~~weekend~~, would have

This situation presents a clear and present danger to the stability of the Persian Gulf and the safety of people everywhere that cannot go unchecked. Without a strong inspection system, Iraq is free to begin rebuilding its weapons and missiles -- in months, not years. Moreover, if Iraq can destroy the weapons inspection system and get away with it, Saddam will conclude that the world has lost its will. He will retain and rebuild his arsenal of destruction. And someday, ~~someway, he will use it.~~

That is why, on the unanimous recommendation of my national security team -- including the ~~Secretary of State and~~ Vice President, the ~~Secretary of Defense~~, the Joints Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, and the National Security Adviser -- I ordered a strong, sustained series of air strikes against Iraq.

~~Secretary of State and~~
~~Secretary of Defense~~
Chairman of

~~We acted today because we had a window of opportunity through which we could achieve tactical surprise. That window was closing fast. The holiest of Muslim holidays, Ramadan, begins on Friday and ends a month later. Saddam Hussein believed that we probably would not initiate an attack during that period. He was right. Striking a predominantly Muslim country during Ramadan -- even one whose cynical leader makes a mockery of religious faith -- would be like striking the Holy Land during the Christmas season. At a time when America is working~~

~~In the judgment of my military advisors, a swift response, with the maximum element of surprise, would be most effective.~~

~~we would give Saddam more time to disperse. And we would initiate action during the Muslim holy month of Ramadan.~~

this weekend would severely undermine ~~the~~ our efforts

~~hard~~ to improve our relationships with the Arab world ~~and advance the Middle East peace process~~; that is something we wanted to avoid -- ~~without giving Iraq a thirty day head start to jump start its weapons program.~~ *as well as a month to prepare.*

I would have preferred that this decision not arise when it did, on the eve of the impeachment debate in the House of Representatives. But world events do not bend to the rhythms of our domestic ~~politics~~ *calendar.* The independent UNSCOM inspectors decided when to begin to test Iraq's cooperation – and when to end that test. When I suspended military action in November, I made absolutely clear that if Saddam did not fully cooperate, we would be prepared to respond militarily – without further diplomacy, delay or warning. That is what I have done today. I was motivated by one concern and one concern only – to protect America's security and to advance our national interests. I would ask Congress and the American people to ~~judge~~ *support* my actions ~~against that standard~~, regardless of their views on the matter before the House.

for their support of this important military operation,

Our military mission is clear: to attack Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program and to make it more difficult for Iraq to threaten its neighbors. [TK: should we use "degrade" language?] At the same time, we are delivering a powerful message to Saddam: if you act recklessly, you will pay a heavy price. In so doing, we make it less likely that Saddam will act recklessly again.

Yes

I hope Saddam will realize what his actions have wrought and come into cooperation with UNSCOM. But we have to be prepared that he will not -- and we must deal with the very real danger he poses. So we will continue to pursue a long term strategy to contain Iraq and ultimately ~~change its government~~ *work for a day when the reign of terror in Iraq is over.*

prepared
making
7 *takes threatening actions, such as*
First, we must be ~~ready~~ *prepared* to use force again if Saddam tries to reconstitute his weapons of mass destruction or their delivery systems... threatens his neighbors... challenges allied aircraft over Iraq... moves against his own Kurdish citizens... or takes other threatening actions [TK: Baker says too vague]. ~~To that end, we will step up intelligence gathering and maintain the No-Fly Zone in the North and from the southern suburbs of Baghdad to the Kuwaiti border.~~ The credible threat to use force -- and, when necessary, the actual use of force -- is the surest way to contain Saddam's weapons of mass destruction program, curtail his aggression and prevent another Gulf War.

Second, as long as Iraq remains out of compliance, we will work with the international community to maintain and enforce economic sanctions. ~~The proof that sanctions hurt the Iraqi regime can be found in Saddam's desperate attempts to lift them.~~ Sanctions have cost Saddam

more than \$120 billion -- resources that almost certainly would have been used to rebuild his military. *The sanctions allow Iraq to sell oil for food. Without the sanctions, we would see oil for tanks and less food for the Iraqi people.* *for the Iraqi people*
The sanctions are aimed at the Iraqi regime, not the Iraqi people. We will continue to allow Iraq to sell oil to pay for food, medicine and other humanitarian supplies.

~~But~~ *with greater threat to Iraq's neighbors*
The hard fact is that so long as Saddam remains in power, he threatens the well-being of his people, the peace of his region and the security of the world. Over the long term, the best way to end that threat once and for all is with a new Iraqi government -- a government ready to live in peace with its neighbors... a government that respects and does not repress the rights of its people. Bringing about change in Baghdad will take time and effort. We will strengthen our engagement with the full range of Iraqi opposition forces and work effectively and prudently with them to hasten the day when Iraq has a government worthy of its people. We stand ready to work with a successor government that abides by international rules and to help it ease the economic debts Saddam's war-mongering has accrued.

Throughout this decade, only our steadfast determination – including President Bush's leadership in liberating Kuwait and, since 1993, our efforts to disarm Iraq, maintain sanctions, enforce the No Fly Zones, and respond firmly to Iraqi provocations – has contained the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. The days ahead will require more strength and resolve.

The decision to use force is never cost free. Whenever American forces are placed in harm's way, we risk the loss of life. And while our strikes are focused on Iraq's military capabilities, there will be unintended Iraqi casualties. Indeed, Saddam has not hesitated to intentionally place Iraqi civilians in harm's way in a cynical bid to sway international opinion. We must be prepared for these realities. At the same time, Saddam should have absolutely no doubt: if he lashes out at his neighbors, we will respond powerfully and decisively.

Heavy as they are, the costs of our action must be weighed against the price of inaction. If Saddam defies the world and we fail to respond, we will face a far graver threat in the future. Saddam will strike again at his neighbors. He will make war on his own people. And mark my words, he will develop weapons of mass destruction. He will deploy them. And he will use them. Because we are acting today, it is less likely that we will face these dangers in the future.

We must be equal to this challenge. In the century we are leaving, America has often made the difference between chaos and community... fear and hope. Now, in a new century, we have a remarkable opportunity to shape a future more peaceful than the past -- but only if we stand strong against the enemies of peace. ~~Our course is clear. Our cause is right. Our resolve is unshakable.~~ May God bless and protect the brave men and women who are carrying out this vital mission. And may God bless America.

12/14/98 8:00 pm 1-1/13/98 10:30 p.m.

Blinken/Halperin

threatens
one of the
most vital
regions
in the world

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON IRAQ
THE WHITE HOUSE
DATE TBD.**

(fourth)
for the ~~third~~ time in a year

For eight years, since the end of the Persian Gulf War, Saddam Hussein has refused to account to the world for his weapons of mass destruction. Now, he has once again broken his commitment to cooperate with the international inspection system established by the United Nations to ensure his compliance. The time for Saddam's evasion and blatant defiance is over. If we allow him Saddam to proceed with impunity, he will rebuild his weapons of mass destruction. And just as he has before, he will use them -- endangering our friends and allies and our own citizens one of the most vital regions of the world. If we do not act decisively now, I have there is no doubt in my mind that in the not too distant future, -- in a year or two or three -- Americans will be called upon to fight another war in the Persian Gulf. We cannot permit that to happen.

I am convinced that

That is why, earlier today, I ordered our armed forces to strike military and security targets in Iraq. They were joined by British forces. They have the support of many of our friends and allies. Their mission is to attack Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program and its capacity to threaten its neighbors. Their mandate is to protect the national interests of the United States -- and, indeed, the interests of people throughout the region and around the world.

I want to speak with you about why we have decided to use force in Iraq and what we hope to accomplish. To that end, I would ask you first to think back to 1991 the beginning of this decade -- to and the end of the Gulf War.

As a condition for the cease-fire, the United Nations demanded and Iraq agreed to declare and destroy all of its chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them. The international community had very good reason to insist on that Saddam Hussein disarm. Other countries have weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. With Saddam, there is one big difference: he has used them. Not once, but repeatedly -- unleashing chemical weapons against Iranian troops during a decade-long war of attrition. Not only against soldiers, but against civilians -- firing SCUD missiles at the citizens of Israel, [Kuwait], Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Iran Tel Aviv, Riyadh and Manama. Not only against a foreign enemy, but against his own people -- gassing Kurdish civilians in northern Iraq. The international community had little doubt then -- and I have no doubt today -- that, left unchecked, Saddam Hussein will use these terrible weapons again.

SKT

SKT?

To ensure that Iraq made good on its commitment to disarm, the UNited Nations kept in place strong tough economic sanctions -- exempting food and medicine and other supplies, and later allowing Iraq to sell oil to buy nearly \$3 billion worth of humanitarian supplies said for its people every year. In 1991, the U.N. also established a highly professional group of weapons inspectors from dozens of countries -- called UNSCOM -- to oversee the destruction of Iraq's arsenal and to verify that Iraq did not attempt to rebuild it. Back then, Iraq agreed to disclose its weapons of

mass destruction capability and to prepare for its destruction within 15 days. It has now been more than 2800 days.

Iraq could have put itself on the path to ending sanctions and its isolation long ago simply by meeting its obligations. Instead, ~~it~~ Iraq has played a deadly game of cheat and retreat -- withholding vital information from the inspectors, harassing them, blocking access to suspect sites, destroying evidence in plain view. Throughout this decade of defiance, Saddam has had one central purpose: ~~to have sanctions lifted while retaining and rebuilding his deadly arsenal~~ weapons of mass destruction.

Saddam Hussein has claimed, again and again, that says he he is has complyingied with his obligation to destroy his arsenal. But no one outside of Baghdad remotely believes that. Let me give you a few examples of Iraq's flagrant failure to comply with its obligations.

- In 1995, following the defection of the head of its weapons program, Iraq admitted what it had denied for four years: that it had developed ~~an offensive biological weapons~~ warfare capability, including 130,000 gallons of biological agents such as anthrax, botulinum and ricin. Iraq also was forced to reveal and destroy a huge factory that it had said was making livestock feed and pesticides -- but was in fact producing biological weapons.

- For nearly five years, Iraq denied that it had produced VX, the deadliest known chemical weapon, or placed it in its arsenal weapons. VX is the most advanced, deadly and long-lasting chemical weapon in the world. Evidence to the contrary forced Iraq to reveal that it did have the existence of a VX program. A panel of international experts confirmed the findings of an American laboratory that VX was present on the remnants of Iraqi missile warheads.

- Just this past summer, an Iraqi air force document discovered by the inspectors showed that after the War, Iraq retained far more chemical munitions than it had disclosed to UNSCOM.

Despite the run-arounds and road blocks, the weapons inspectors have done a remarkable job. Through dogged determination and tremendous skill, they ~~found and destroyed more of Iraq's~~ weapons of mass destruction and missile capability than was destroyed during the Gulf War. This includes nearly 40,000 chemical weapons, more than 690 tons of chemical weapons agents, a facility to make nuclear materials, 48 operational missiles and 30 warheads specially fitted for chemical and biological weapons.

But UNSCOM's mission is not yet finished. ~~UNSCOM has said that Iraq has not adequately accounted for stockpiles of chemical and biological munitions and a small number of missiles.~~ Iraq has failed to explain the many discrepancies between what it claims to have destroyed and the evidence. And it still has the capacity to restart rebuild its production program for chemical and biological weapons and, perhaps most importantly, the missiles to deliver them. As UNSCOM has closed in on Iraq's remaining weapons capacity, Saddam's intentions have become all the clearer: to break the inspection system.

This crisis did not come upon us suddenly, nor have we acted precipitously. Three times in the past wice before in the past year, Saddam has tried to cripple the inspectors. EachBoth times, at considerable cost and effort, we built tremendous diplomatic pressure on Iraq, backed by overwhelming force. EachBoth times, at the 11th hour, Baghdad reversed course.

[This time, in August, Iraq suspended cooperation with the inspectors and placed before the international community a brazen demand: despite all of the evidence to the contrary, declare Iraq in compliance with its obligations. Get rid of the sanctions, but let Iraq keep its weapons of mass destruction capability. That is an offer that no one in the world could accept. And no one didhas. In November, tThe United Nations Security Council recently voted 15 to zero to condemn Saddam's actions as a "flagrant violation" of its resolutions and demand that he immediately come into compliance. Soon after This week, eight Arab nations -- Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and five other Gulf states -- warned Saddam that Iraq alone would bear responsibility for the consequences of defying the United Nations.

Compliance

Still, Saddam failed to comply or even to make an unequivocal pledge to comply. So last month, the United States, with Great Britain, and with the support of friends and allies, prepared to strike. It was only then, at the last possible moment, that Iraq sent a letter claiming it had made, and I quote, "a clear and unconditional decision ... to resume cooperation with UNSCOM and the IAEA" -- the International Atomic Energy Agency. This unqualified commitment was enough to cause us to change course. It was enough to give Iraq one last chance. But Iraq's claimed cooperation cannot even be called short-lived. It had no life at all. It was, it turned out, another empty pledge promise

Call back our strike force

On November 15, I made very clear what constituted the unconditional cooperation we expected -- five points derived directly, as UN Secretary General Annan noted, from existing UN resolutions and Iraq's own commitments. Iraq had to: first, resolve all outstanding issues raised by UNSCOM and the IAEA; second, give the weapons inspectors unfettered access to sites, with no restrictions or qualifications; third, turn over all relevant documents; fourth, accept all UN resolutions related to weapons of mass destruction; and finally, not interfere with the independence or professional expertise of the inspectors.

In calling this all strike

Iraq has utterly failed to take these steps. UNSCOM inspection teams went back to Iraq to test Baghdad's pledges as to each issue where Iraq had previously offered resistance. UNSCOM's three weeks of inspection activity ended last Sunday, and today, UNSCOM's chairman, Richard Butler, issued a report concluding []

Iraq has failed to resolve outstanding issues or honor UN resolutions. When UNSCOM requested information on Iraq's weapons programs, Iraq refused, claiming that any further explanations should await a comprehensive review by the UN. This flies directly in the face of a UN resolution providing that such a review will be considered only after Iraq resumes compliance with the inspectors.

Cooperation

Iraq has failed to give the inspectors unfettered and unqualified access. While Iraq has cooperated with some inspections, it has restricted or impeded others. On November 25, Iraq barred UNSCOM from inspecting a base in eastern Iraq [controlled by an Iranian opposition group]. On December 5, Iraq restricted UNSCOM's ability to photograph bombs related to its chemical weapons program. That same day, it tried to prevent an UNSCOM biological weapons

(to suspect sites)

monitoring team from videotaping and photocopying, and prevented them from asking questions of the Iraqis on site. Just prior to an UNSCOM inspection of another site (on December 10) the Iraqis emptied out the building -- removing all documents, furniture and equipment. [Also that day] Iraq blocked access to an office of its ruling party in Baghdad. Now Iraq says it will block access to the party's other offices, even though UN resolutions make no exception for them, and even though UNSCOM has inspected them in the past. Now Iraq says it has stopped allowing some inspections on Fridays, even though UNSCOM has been doing inspections on Fridays for seven years.

Iraq has failed to turn over relevant documents. Indeed, of the twelve sets of documents UNSCOM has requested, Iraq has provided only one. Iraq has denied the existence of some documents and questioned UNSCOM's need for others. [possible additional point from CIA.]

[Finally, instead of accepting the independence of the UN inspection teams, Iraq has now formally asked the UN to investigate its charges that UNSCOM inspectors are spies for other nations.]

In short, Iraq has continued its old ways. It has demonstrated that it is, for now, unwilling to cooperate with the UN's efforts. Our demand -- and the UN's demand -- was for full cooperation, not partial or half-hearted cooperation -- because only such a clear break with Iraq's past pattern of concealment and defiance could convince us that Iraq has indeed decided to give up its mass destruction weapons once and for all. Iraq has failed this test.

Last month, we made our position clear: We would tolerate no more games from Iraq. We would provide no more warnings. There would be no more chances.

Since this crisis first began fourteen thirteen-months ago, we have sought a peaceful and principled solution. Accomplishing our goals peacefully is always preferable, and the threshold for using military force should be high. But Saddam's has not reversed course. And his repeated failure to cooperate with decision to end the inspections system creates a clear and present danger to the stability of the Persian Gulf and the security of people everywhere that. That danger cannot go unchecked. The stakes are simply too high.

Without a robust inspection system, Iraq is free to begin rebuilding an arsenal of mass destruction chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and ~~thand~~ e-missiles to deliver them -- in a matter of months, not years. At the same time, if Iraq can unilaterally terminate inspections with impunity, and we do not respond firmly, the message to Saddam to Saddam will be clear: The international community has given you a green light. Our commitments to use threats of force are hollow and meaningless. Saddam will conclude that the world has lost its will. He will rebuild an arsenal of weapons. And someday, someday he will use them.

Our military strikes As you can understand, I will not go into the specifics of our strike at this time. But let me say that this campaign has have a clear purpose, and is part of a long term strategy. By attacking Saddam's weapons of mass destruction program and his military infrastructure, we will deliver a powerful response to his decision to impede end the inspections. We will and makmake it more difficult for him to threaten his neighbors.

I very much hope that Saddam will realize what his actions have wrought and come into cooperation with UNSCOM. But we have to be prepared that he will not -- and we must deal with the very real danger he poses. So we must pursue a What-is-our-long term strategy..?

First, we must be ~~remain~~ ready to use force again if Saddam ~~tries~~ attempts to reconstitute build his weapons of mass destruction or their delivery systems, threatens his neighbors, challenges our aircraft or that of our allies' in their mission over Iraq, moves against his own citizens, or takes other threatening actions, including moves against his own Kurdish citizens. We will step up our intelligence gathering and maintain the No Fly Zone in the North and from the southern suburbs of Baghdad to the Kuwaiti border to alert us to Iraq's activities. The credible threat to use force when necessary ~~made more credible today~~ is the surest way to contain the danger that Saddam poses's aggression.

Second, as long as Saddam Hussein remains out of compliance, we will work with the international community to maintain and enforce ~~what have been among the most extensive~~ sanctions in history. Sanctions hurt the Iraqi regime. The proof can be found in Saddam's desperate attempts to lift them. To date, sanctions have cost Saddam more than \$120 billion -- resources that ~~could and almost certainly would have been used to rebuild his military.~~ The sanctions are aimed at the Iraqi regime, not the Iraqi people. We will continue to allow Iraq to sell oil and use the proceeds to pay for the food, medicine and other humanitarian supplies its people need.

But the hard fact is that so long as Saddam remains in power, he represents a potential threat to the well-being of his people, the peace of his region and the security of the world. Over the long term, as I said last month, the best way to end that threat once and for all is with a different Iraqi government -- a government ready that is prepared to live in peace with its neighbors... a government that respects the rights of its people rather than suppressing them.

~~Let me be clear:~~ bringing about change in Baghdad won't happen over night. It will take time and effort, but we will actively pursue that goal. We will strengthen our engagement with the full range of Iraqi opposition forces and work effectively and prudently with them to hasten the day when Iraq has a government worthy of its people. [The Iraq Liberation Act passed by Congress, and which I recently signed, adds greater resources to this long term effort.]

My fellow Americans, throughout this decade, only our steadfast determination -- in liberating Kuwait under the leadership of President Bush and, since 1991, in strongly supporting the effort to disarm Iraq, maintaining sanctions, enforcing No Fly Zones and responding firmly to Iraqi provocations -- has contained the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. The weeks and months ahead will require more of our determination, our strength and our resolve.

The decision to use force today inexorably carries with it costs. Whenever American armed forces are placed in harm's way, we risk the loss of life. And while our strikes are focused on Iraq's military capabilities, there will be unintended Iraqi casualties. Indeed, Saddam has not hesitated to increase the danger to victimize his own people in order to divert the world's attention. We must be prepared for these realities. At the same time, Moreover, Saddam should have absolutely no doubt: if he lashes out at his neighbors, we will respond forcefully and decisively.

develop WMD. He will deploy them. And he will use them.

~~But these costs of our action, heavy as they are, must be weighed against the price to the American people and to the world of inaction. If Saddam defies the world and we fail to respond, if he escapes from inspections and we turn our backs, we will face a far graver threat in the future. Saddam will strike again at his neighbors. He will make war on his own people. Even worse, he will develop weapons of mass destruction. He will deploy them. And mark my words, he will unleash weapons of mass destruction on them. By acting today, it is less likely that we will face those dangers in the future.~~

We must be equal to this challenge. In the century we are leaving, America has often made the difference between tyranny and freedom... chaos and community... fear and hope. Now, in a new century, we have a remarkable opportunity to shape a future more peaceful and secure than the past -- but only if we stand strong against enemies of peace ~~those who would destroy peace and threaten security~~. Our course is clear. Our cause is right. Our resolve is unshakable.

May God bless and protect the brave men and women who are carrying out this vital mission. And may God bless America.

12/14/98 8:00 pm
Blinken/Halperin

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON IRAQ
THE WHITE HOUSE
DATE TBD.**

For eight years, since the end of the Persian Gulf War, Saddam Hussein has refused to account to the world for his weapons of mass destruction. Now, he has once again broken his commitment to cooperate with the inspection system established by the United Nations. The time for Saddam's evasion and blatant defiance is over. If we allow him to proceed with impunity, he will rebuild his weapons of mass destruction. And just as he has before, he will use them -- endangering our friends and allies and our own citizens. If we do not act decisively now, I have no doubt that in the not too distant future, Americans will be called upon to fight another war in the Persian Gulf. We cannot permit that to happen.

That is why, earlier today, I ordered our armed forces to strike military and security targets in Iraq. They were joined by British forces. They have the support of many of our friends and allies. Their mission is to attack Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program and its capacity to threaten its neighbors. Their mandate is to protect the national interests of the United States -- and, indeed, the interests of people throughout the region and around the world.

I want to speak with you about why we have decided to use force and what we hope to accomplish. To that end, I would ask you first to think back to 1991 -- to the end of the Gulf War.

As a condition for the cease-fire, the UN demanded and Iraq agreed to declare and destroy all of its chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and missiles to deliver them. The international community had very good reason to insist on that. Other countries have weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. With Saddam, there is one big difference: he has used them. Not once, but repeatedly -- unleashing chemical weapons against Iranian troops during a decade-long war. Not only against soldiers, but against civilians -- firing SCUD missiles at the citizens of Israel, [Kuwait], Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Iran. Not only against a foreign enemy, but against his own people -- gassing Kurdish civilians in northern Iraq. The international community had little doubt then -- and I have no doubt today -- that, left unchecked, Saddam Hussein will use these terrible weapons again.

To ensure that Iraq made good on its commitment to disarm, the UN kept in place strong economic sanctions -- exempting food and medicine, and later allowing Iraq to sell oil to buy humanitarian supplies. In 1991, the UN also established a highly professional group of weapons inspectors from dozens of countries -- called UNSCOM -- to oversee the destruction of Iraq's arsenal and verify that Iraq did not attempt to rebuild it. Iraq agreed to disclose its weapons of mass destruction capability and to prepare for its destruction within 15 days. It has now been more than 2800 days.

Iraq could have put itself on the path to ending sanctions long ago by meeting its obligations. Instead, it has played a deadly game of cheat and retreat -- withholding vital information from

the inspectors, harassing them, blocking access to suspect sites, destroying evidence in plain view. Throughout this decade of defiance, Saddam has had one central purpose: to have sanctions lifted while retaining and rebuilding his deadly arsenal.

Saddam Hussein has claimed, again and again, that he is complying. But no one remotely believes that. Let me give you a few examples of Iraq's flagrant failure to comply.

- In 1995, following the defection of the head of its weapons program, Iraq admitted what it had denied for four years: that it had developed biological weapons, including 130,000 gallons of biological agents such as anthrax. Iraq also was forced to reveal and destroy a huge factory that it had said was making livestock feed and pesticides -- but was in fact producing biological weapons.
- For nearly five years, Iraq denied that it had produced VX, the deadliest known chemical weapon, or placed it in its arsenal. Evidence to the contrary forced Iraq to reveal that it did have a VX program. A panel of international experts confirmed that VX was present on the remnants of Iraqi missile warheads.
- This past summer, an Iraqi air force document discovered by the inspectors showed that after the War, Iraq retained far more chemical munitions than it had disclosed to UNSCOM.

Despite the run-arounds and road blocks, the inspectors have done a remarkable job. Through dogged determination and tremendous skill, they found and destroyed more of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and missile capability than was destroyed during the Gulf War. This includes nearly 40,000 chemical weapons, more than 690 tons of chemical weapons agents, a facility to make nuclear materials, 48 operational missiles and 30 warheads specially fitted for chemical and biological weapons.

But UNSCOM's mission is not finished. Iraq has failed to explain the many discrepancies between what it claims to have destroyed and the evidence. And it still has the capacity to restart production for chemical and biological weapons and, perhaps most importantly, the missiles to deliver them. As UNSCOM has closed in on Iraq's remaining weapons capacity, Saddam's intentions have become all the clearer: to break the inspection system.

This crisis did not come upon us suddenly, nor have we acted precipitously. Three times in the past year, Saddam has tried to cripple the inspectors. Each time, at considerable cost and effort, we built tremendous diplomatic pressure on Iraq, backed by overwhelming force. Each time, at the 11th hour, Baghdad reversed course.

In August, Iraq suspended cooperation with the inspectors and placed before the international community a brazen demand: despite all the evidence to the contrary, declare Iraq in compliance. Get rid of the sanctions, but let Iraq keep its weapons capability. That is an offer no one in the world could accept. And no one did. In November, the UN Security Council voted 15 to zero to condemn Saddam's actions and demand that he immediately come into compliance. Soon after, eight Arab nations -- Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and five other Gulf states -- warned that Iraq alone would bear responsibility for the consequences of defying the UN.

Still, Saddam failed to comply or even to make an unequivocal pledge to comply. So last month, the United States, with Great Britain, and with the support of friends and allies, prepared to strike. It was only then, at the last possible moment, that Iraq sent a letter claiming it had made, and I quote, "a clear and unconditional decision ... to resume cooperation with UNSCOM and the IAEA" -- the International Atomic Energy Agency. This unqualified commitment was enough to cause us to change course. It was enough to give Iraq one last chance. But Iraq's claimed cooperation cannot even be called short-lived. It had no life at all. It was, it turned out, another empty pledge.

On November 15, I made very clear what constituted the unconditional cooperation we expected -- five points derived directly, as UN Secretary General Annan noted, from existing UN resolutions and Iraq's own commitments. Iraq had to: first, resolve all outstanding issues raised by UNSCOM and the IAEA; second, give the weapons inspectors unfettered access to sites, with no restrictions or qualifications; third, turn over all relevant documents; fourth, accept all UN resolutions related to weapons of mass destruction; and finally, not interfere with the independence or professional expertise of the inspectors.

Iraq has utterly failed to take these steps. UNSCOM inspection teams went back to Iraq to test Baghdad's pledges as to each issue where Iraq had previously offered resistance. UNSCOM's three weeks of inspection activity ended last Sunday, and today, UNSCOM's chairman, Richard Butler, issued a report concluding [].

Iraq has failed to resolve outstanding issues or honor UN resolutions. When UNSCOM requested information on Iraq's weapons programs, Iraq refused, claiming that any further explanations should await a comprehensive review by the UN. This flies directly in the face of a UN resolution providing that such a review will be considered only after Iraq resumes compliance with the inspectors.

Iraq has failed to give the inspectors unfettered and unqualified access. While Iraq has cooperated with some inspections, it has restricted or impeded others. On November 25, Iraq barred UNSCOM from inspecting a base in eastern Iraq [controlled by an Iranian opposition group]. On December 5, Iraq restricted UNSCOM's ability to photograph bombs related to its chemical weapons program. That same day, it tried to prevent an UNSCOM biological weapons monitoring team from videotaping and photocopying, and prevented them from asking questions of the Iraqis on site. Just prior to an UNSCOM inspection of another site on December 10, the Iraqis emptied out the building -- removing all documents, furniture and equipment. Also that day, Iraq blocked access to an office of its ruling party in Baghdad. Now Iraq says it will block access to the party's other offices, even though UN resolutions make no exception for them, and even though UNSCOM has inspected them in the past. Now Iraq says it has stopped allowing some inspections on Fridays, even though UNSCOM has been doing inspections on Fridays for seven years.

Iraq has failed to turn over relevant documents. Indeed, of the twelve sets of documents UNSCOM has requested, Iraq has provided only one. Iraq has denied the existence of some documents and questioned UNSCOM's need for others. [possible additional point from CIA.]

[Finally, instead of accepting the independence of the UN inspection teams, Iraq has now formally asked the UN to investigate its charges that UNSCOM inspectors are spies for other nations.]

In short, Iraq has continued its old ways. It has demonstrated that it is, for now, unwilling to cooperate with the UN's efforts. Our demand -- and the UN's demand -- was for full cooperation, not partial or half-hearted cooperation -- because only such a clear break with Iraq's past pattern of concealment and defiance could convince us that Iraq has indeed decided to give up its mass destruction weapons once and for all. Iraq has failed this test.

Last month, we made our position clear: We would tolerate no more games from Iraq. We would provide no more warnings. There would be no more chances.

Since this crisis first began fourteen months ago, we have sought a peaceful and principled solution. Accomplishing our goals peacefully is always preferable, and the threshold for using military force should be high. But Saddam's repeated failure to cooperate with the inspections creates a clear and present danger that cannot go unchecked. The stakes are simply too high.

Without a robust inspection system, Iraq is free to begin rebuilding an arsenal of mass destruction weapons and missiles -- in months, not years. If Iraq can terminate inspections with impunity, and we do not respond firmly, the message to Saddam will be clear: Our commitments to use force are hollow and meaningless. The world has lost its will.

Our military strikes have a clear purpose. By attacking Saddam's weapons of mass destruction and his military infrastructure, we will deliver a powerful response to his decision to impede the inspections. We will make it more difficult for him to threaten his neighbors.

I hope Saddam will realize what his actions have wrought and come into cooperation with UNSCOM. But we have to be prepared that he will not -- and we must deal with the very real danger he poses. So we must pursue a long term strategy.

First, we must be ready to use force again if Saddam tries to reconstitute his weapons of mass destruction, threatens his neighbors, challenges our aircraft or our allies' over Iraq, moves against his own citizens, or takes other threatening actions. We will step up our intelligence and maintain the No Fly Zone in the North and from the southern suburbs of Baghdad to the Kuwaiti border. The credible threat to use force when necessary is the surest way to contain Saddam's aggression.

Second, as long as Saddam remains out of compliance, we will work with the international community to maintain and enforce the sanctions. Sanctions hurt the Iraqi regime. The proof can be found in Saddam's desperate attempts to lift them. To date, sanctions have cost Saddam more than \$120 billion -- resources that almost certainly would have been used to rebuild his military. The sanctions are aimed at the Iraqi regime, not the Iraqi people. We will continue to allow Iraq to sell oil to pay for food, medicine and other humanitarian supplies.

But the hard fact is that so long as Saddam remains in power, he represents a potential threat to the well-being of his people, the peace of his region and the security of the world. Over the long term, as I said last month, the best way to end that threat once and for all is with a different Iraqi

government -- a government ready to live in peace with its neighbors... a government that respects the rights of its people rather than suppressing them.

Bringing about change in Baghdad won't happen over night. It will take time and effort. We will strengthen our engagement with the full range of Iraqi opposition forces and work effectively and prudently with them to hasten the day when Iraq has a government worthy of its people. [The Iraq Liberation Act passed by Congress, and which I signed, adds greater resources to this long term effort.]

My fellow Americans, throughout this decade, only our steadfast determination -- in liberating Kuwait under the leadership of President Bush and, since 1991, in responding firmly to Iraqi provocations -- has contained the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. The months ahead will require more strength and resolve.

The decision to use force inexorably carries with it costs. Whenever American forces are placed in harm's way, we risk the loss of life. And while our strikes are focused on Iraq's military capabilities, there will be unintended Iraqi casualties. Indeed, Saddam has not hesitated to increase the danger to his own people in order to divert the world's attention. We must be prepared for these realities. At the same time, Saddam should have absolutely no doubt: if he lashes out at his neighbors, we will respond forcefully and decisively.

The costs of our action, heavy as they are, must be weighed against the price of inaction. If Saddam defies the world and we fail to respond, we will face a far graver threat in the future. Saddam will strike again at his neighbors. He will make war on his own people. And mark my words, he will unleash weapons of mass destruction.

We must be equal to this challenge. In the century we are leaving, America has often made the difference between tyranny and freedom... chaos and community... fear and hope. Now, in a new century, we have a remarkable opportunity to shape a future more peaceful than the past -- but only if we stand strong against enemies of peace. Our course is clear. Our cause is right. And our resolve is unshakable.

May God bless and protect the brave men and women who are carrying out this vital mission. And may God bless America.